Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-92-034
Thursday
20 February 1992

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-92-034 *20 February 1992*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'Brain Drain' Conference Drafts Program *[TASS]* 1
Yeltsin Plans 'In Need of Major Corrections' *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 1
Results of Yeltsin Initiatives Still Unclear *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 7 Feb]* 3
Proximity of U.S., Russian Arms Cuts Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Feb]* 4
New Initiative Program Cancels Projects *[INTERFAX]* 5
'Unsanctioned Use' of Nuclear Storehouses Eyed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Feb]* 5
Republics' Locations of Nuclear Materials Eyed *[MEGAPOLIS EKSPRESS 9 Jan]* 8
'Centralized Super Storage' Facility Proposed *[MEGAPOLIS EKSPRESS 9 Jan]* 9
'Full Public Control' Urged for Disarmament *[PRAVDA 17 Feb]* 10
Experts View Flaws in Arms Export Policy *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 12
Nuclear Free Zone Set Up With U.S. City *[POSTFACTUM]* 13

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Further Details on Submarine Collision 14
Engaged in 'Collecting Data' *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Navy Press Center Responds *[TASS]* 14
Pentagon on Collision *[TASS]* 14
Policy Issues Underlying Baker Tour Examined *[IZVESTIYA 14 Feb]* 15
Debate on CIS Stabilization Fund noted *[IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]* 16
Implications of Western Aid Highlighted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Feb]* 17
Scale of U.S. Aid Airlift to CIS Reported *[IZVESTIYA 11 Feb]* 18
Kuwaiti Plans for Aiding CIS States Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]* 19
'Battle' for Central Asian Republics Continues *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Feb]* 19
Black Sea Officer Seeks Asylum in Turkey *[TASS]* 19
Arms Trading Claims in Czechoslovakia Denied *[IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]* 20

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Commonwealth

Shaposhnikov Address on Nagorno-Karabakh Issue *[TASS]* 21
General Ivashov on Results of Minsk Summit *[TASS]* 21

Baltics

'Calm Waiting Period' Advocated in Relations *[Tallinn Radio]* 22

Military

Future of Former Soviet Navy Discussed, Viewed 22
Main Staff Favors Unity *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 12 Feb]* 22
Legalities, Impediments Assessed *[Moscow International]* 22
Army Uncertainties Jeopardize CIS Security *[IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]* 23
Transition Needed Before Red Army Dissolution *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 24
Model for CIS States' Security Propounded *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 12 Feb]* 25
Response to Flight of Bombers Noted *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI 23 Feb]* 27

Political & Social

29th Congress of Communist Party Set for Summer 27
130 Members Gather *[TASS]* 27
Russian Party Walks Out *[INTERFAX]* 27
Declared 'Emergency Conference' *[INTERFAX]* 28
Congress Date Revised *[TASS]* 28
Committee Formed To Organize Deputies' Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Feb]* 28
Gorbachev Says Democratization Still Reversible *[Berlin ADN]* 29
Shevardnadze on Ethnic Conflicts, Refugees 29
Ethnic Conflicts 'Acutest Problem' *[INTERFAX]* 29
Notes 10,000 Refugees *[Radio Rossii]* 30

Economic

Central Banks Directors Confer in Moscow 30
Single Ruble Zone Discussed *[INTERFAX]* 30
No Agreement on Union *[INTERFAX]* 30
Internal Prize Loan Draw for 15 Feb Cancelled *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 30
Debt Payment Via Warhead Sales Scenario Viewed
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Feb] 31

Media

TASS Carries Press Review for 15 Feb 32
PRAVDA Review for 17 Feb *[TASS]* 33
Press Review for 18 Feb *[TASS]* 33
Press Review for 19 Feb *[TASS]* 34
Press Review for 20 Feb *[TASS]* 34

RUSSIA

International Affairs

Armenia-Azerbaijan Mediation Begins in Moscow 36
Yeltsin Willing To Meet Presidents *[Radio Rossii]* 36
Leader's Visit Said 'Unrelated' *[INTERFAX]* 36
Mutalibov Proposes Three-Stage Plan *[INTERFAX]* 36
Yeltsin Adviser 'Not Optimistic' *[TASS]* 36
Shakray Reviews 'Positive' Minsk Meeting *[TASS]* 37
Agreement With Ukraine Reached on Armed Forces *[POSTFACTUM]* 37
Ukraine Questions Russian Role as USSR Heir *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* 37
Ukraine Asks for Return of Sukhoy Bombers *[Russian TV]* 38
Crew Members of Unsanctioned Flight Reassigned *[TASS]* 38
Kozyrev on Human Rights in Foreign Policy *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 38
Deryabin on 'Principle of Interference' *[Prague RESPEKT 10-16 Feb]* 39
'Minimum' 'Ideology' Foreign Policy Idea Noted *[TASS]* 41
Interest in 'Near Abroad' After Baker Visit *[PRAVDA 19 Feb]* 42
Ambassador Lukin on U.S. Ties, Joint Projects *[TASS]* 43
New Edicts May Discourage Western Investment *[INTERFAX]* 43
U.S., EC Aid Programs for Russia Contrasted *[IZVESTIYA 12 Feb]* 44
U.S. Aid Said 'Unforthcoming,' 'Slow' *[PRAVDA 10 Feb]* 44
Lack of Russian Ports Affects Sea-Borne Aid *[IZVESTIYA 17 Feb]* 44
Sugar Supplies Low; Cuban Shipment Expected *[Radio Rossii]* 45

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Interviewed on Current Issues *[Russian TV]* 45
Presidential Consultative Council Meets 19 Feb *[Moscow TV]* 53
Session Chaired by Yeltsin *[INTERFAX]* 53
1982 Bonds To Be Honored *[Moscow TV]* 53

Government Discusses 'Stabilization Measures' *[TASS]* 54
'Large' Economic Package Adopted *[TASS]* 54
Yeltsin Signs Decree on Protection of Servicemen *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Yeltsin Aide Responds to Resignation Rumors *[IZVESTIYA 20 Feb]* 54
Yeltsin Adviser Outlines Army Reform Ideas *[KURANTY 19 Feb]* 55
Cited on Possible Nomination *[INTERFAX]* 56
Khasbulatov Interviewed on Domestic Policy *[TASS]* 56
Stankevich: Unity Must Be Maintained *[INTERFAX]* 58
Civil Aviation Pilots' Strike Set for 25 Mar *[Radio Rossii]* 59
Government Meets With Air Traffic Controllers *[TASS]* 59
Minister Cites Demands *[IZVESTIYA 20 Feb]* 59
Foreign Intelligence Official on Activities *[Moscow Radio]* 59
Further on Briefing *[TASS]* 60
Security Organizations Accorded Special Rights *[Russian TV]* 60
Further on Democratic Reform Movement Congress *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 17 Feb]* 61
Considered 'Constructive Opposition' *[Radio Rossii]* 61
Popov Cited on Goals *[INTERFAX]* 61
Communist Workers Party Opposes CPSU Revival *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 Feb]* 62
Russian Communist Party Policy Summarized *[TASS]* 62
Anti-Zionist Nationalists Attend Congress *[Russian TV]* 63
New 'Workers Party' Profiled *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 Feb]* 63
INTERFAX Corrects 'Inaccurate Report' on Gold 63

Supreme Soviet

Proceedings of 19 Feb Session Reviewed *[Russian TV]* 64
Deputy Chairman Filatov Heads 17 Feb Presidium *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 Feb]* 64
German District in Omsk Region Endorsed *[POSTFACTUM]* 65
Further Shaposhnikov Comments on Coup Attempt *[Russian TV]* 65
Bill on Security Slated for Discussion *[INTERFAX]* 65
Chambers Hold Joint Session 14 Feb *[Moscow TV]* 66
Sixth Congress Agenda Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 66
Congress Agenda Detailed *[TASS]* 66
'Quiet' Putsch Fails *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 18 Feb]* 67
Deputy Address on Border Accord With PRC *[Russian TV]* 68
Deputy Outlines Introduction of Bank Checks *[Russian TV]* 69
Decree on Responsibility for Military Tribunals *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 11 Feb]* 69
Treaty on Kyrgyzstan Relations Ratified *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 11 Feb]* 70
Deputies Demand Referendum on Tatar Republic *[Radio Rossii]* 70
Mint To Be Subordinated to Central Bank *[INTERFAX]* 70

Regional Affairs

Local Communist Workers Party Holds Conference *[TASS]* 71
Party Committees Reestablished *[INTERFAX]* 71
Communist Conference Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Feb]* 71
Mayor Signs Accord With Unions, Businesses *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Regional, Local Leaders Meet in St. Petersburg *[IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]* 72
Burbulis Postpones Visit to Komi Republic *[TASS]* 72
Popov Refuses Permission for 23 Feb Gatherings *[INTERFAX]* 73
Tatars Call For 'Sovereign Republic' in Siberia *[TASS]* 73
Tatar Chairman Will Not Work in Supreme Soviet *[POSTFACTUM]* 73
Udmurt Paper Loses Supreme Soviet Financing *[UDMURTSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 73
Buryat Republic Appeals to Yeltsin, Government *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Bashkir Supreme Soviet Annuls Land Resolution *[Radio Rossii 13 Feb]* 74
Ryazan Oblast Protests Moscow Food Subsidies *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 17 Feb]* 74

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kravchuk Proposes Nuclear Talks With U.S. *[Kiev Radio]* 75
Comments on Crimea *[TASS]* 75
Black Sea Fleet 'Sell-Off' Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Feb]* 76
Kravchuk Cable to Yeltsin on Bombers *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Feb]* 77
Commonwealth Meeting in Minsk Viewed *[Kiev Radio]* 77
Kuwaiti Oil Minister Holds Talks in Kiev *[Kiev Radio]* 79

National Affairs

Morozov Says Armed Forces Creation No Threat *[Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA 13 Feb]* 79
Official Killed in Explosion After Interview 80
Calls Russia 'Arrogant' *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 14 Feb]* 80
Death Investigated *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 18 Feb]* 81
Government Nationalizes Communist Party Property *[INTERFAX]* 81
Fleet Ready To 'Help' Build Ukraine Force *[Moscow Radio]* 81
Over 300 Republic Soldiers Reportedly Desert *[Moscow TV]* 82
Party Elite Reportedly Built Secret Shelters *[NARODNA HAZETA Jan 92]* 82

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Says Armed Forces Creation Likely *[POSTFACTUM]* 83
Diplomatic Relations Established With Austria *[TASS]* 83
President's Envoy Meets With Japanese Leaders *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 83
Briefs Media on Talks *[TASS]* 84
Commission Recommends Joint Command of Baykonyr *[Moscow International]* 84
Impact of Major Price Increases Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 17 Feb]* 85

Kyrgyzstan

Government To Follow Independent Military Policy *[INTERFAX]* 85
President Meets With Swiss Counterpart in Bern *[TASS]* 86
Says CIS 'Absolutely Necessary' *[TASS]* 86
Ends Visit *[TASS]* 86
President Signs Diplomatic Accord in Ottawa *[TASS]* 87

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Official Denies Forces Massing on Border *[Radio Rossii]* 88
Spokesman Answers Turkish Leader's Remarks *[TASS]* 88
Nagorno-Karabakh Proposals Presented to CSCE *[ARMENPRES]* 88

Azerbaijan

State of Emergency Introduced in Two Rayons *[TASS]* 89
Foreign Ministry Sends Protest Note to Armenia *[TASS]* 89
CIS Troops Accused of Siding With Armenians *[Moscow TV]* 89
Report Denied *[ARMENPRES]* 89
'Evidence' Backs Charge *[INTERFAX]* 89
Commander Seeks Probe *[TASS]* 90
Leader Claims West Sending Arms to Armenia *[Istanbul TURKIYE 11 Feb]* 90
Gasanov Addresses European Parliament Commission *[TASS]* 91
Nagorno-Karabakh Leader Supports Peace Talks *[TASS]* 91
Nagorno-Karabakh Ministers Criticize Attacks *[POSTFACTUM]* 91

Soldiers Banned From Carrying Weapons in Baku *[Radio Rossii]* 92
Authorities Detain 4 Russian Deserters *[INTERFAX]* 92
Mutalibov Removes Defense Minister From Post *[Moscow Radio]* 92

Georgia

Russian Explanation on 'Volunteers' Demanded *[INTERFAX]* 92
South Ossetia Remains 'Relatively Stable' *[TASS]* 92
Gamsakhurdia Said To Return 'Today or Tomorrow' *[Moscow Radio]* 93
Teachers, Students Protest *[Tbilisi Radio]* 93
Guard Withdraws From Abkhazia; Bridge Blown Up *[Moscow TV]* 93

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Prime Minister Vahi Seeks New Elections Soon *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 13 Feb]* 94
Vahi Shares Opinion of Russian 'Blockade' *[IZVESTIYA 18 Feb]* 94
Supreme Council Deliberations Reported 94
New Central Faction Formed *[Tallinn Radio]* 94
Russian Democrats' Charter Refused *[BALTFAX]* 94
New Draft of Constitution Submitted *[BALTFAX]* 95
Finnish Prime Minister's Visit Reported *[Helsinki Radio]* 95
Officials Meet With Council of Europe Secretary *[BALTFAX]* 95
CIS Trade Procedures Established 17 Feb *[TASS]* 96

Lithuania

Troops To Leave Even Without Bilateral Accord 96
To Begin Exiting in Feb *[BALTFAX]* 96
Defense Minister Satisfied *[Vilnius Radio]* 96
Landsbergis on Army Withdrawal *[Vilnius Radio]* 96
Landsbergis Interviewed *[Moscow International]* 97
Landsbergis Delivers Independence Day Address *[Vilnius Radio]* 97
Yeltsin Sends Congratulations *[Vilnius Radio]* 98
Landsbergis Says CIS 'Stabilizing Factor' *[Vilnius Radio]* 98
Landsbergis Meets Council of Europe Secretary *[BALTFAX]* 98
Quayle Visit, Relations with U.S. Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 11 Feb]* 99
'Crimes' By Military Units Cause for Concern 99
Telegram Sent to Shakhray *[Vilnius International]* 99
Commander Arrested After Search *[Vilnius International]* 100
Russia Resumes Oil Supplies After Disruption *[Vilnius International]* 100
Former KGB Officers Send Warning in Letter *[TASS]* 100

'Brain Drain' Conference Drafts Program

LD1902122692 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 18 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow February 18 TASS—Russia has adopted a draft state programme to stop the brain drain in the Republic.

A total of 79 percent of scientists from 25 Moscow institutes polled said "the brain drain reflects the dire economic situation in the country, which does not value its intellectual potential".

The draft programme, adopted at the conference "Brain Drain in Modern Russia: Domestic and International Aspects" on Tuesday [18 February], aims to adopt a law on intellectual property, simplify the procedure for scientists' return to their institutes after working in foreign countries and grant them the right to dual citizenship.

The draft also envisages state support for scientists through various foundations.

The draft has been sent to the Russian Government.

Yeltsin Plans 'In Need of Major Corrections'

PM1402151792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 5

[Feature prepared by A. Sychev based on interview with Georgiy Arbatov, member of the Consultative Council under the Russian president and director of the U.S. and Canada Institute: place and date not given: "The Author of the Russian Initiatives Is Still Unknown, but the Disarmament Proposals Themselves Are in Need of Major Corrections"]

[Text] The rapid exchange of initiatives in the nuclear disarmament sphere between the United States and Russia, and particularly the scale of these initiatives, has come as something of a shock to the world public. Having given an initially positive response, Western politicians and experts have taken "time out" for a more detailed assessment of the proposals and the consequences of their implementation. This is justified, Academician Georgiy Arbatov, member of the Consultative Council under the Russian president and director of the U.S. and Canada Institute, believes.

The Initiatives Have Major Significance

Academician Georgiy Arbatov gave a positive assessment of the overall result of the initiatives and the meetings held in New York. Basically, the West was awaiting confirmation of the continuity of our policy, primarily with regard to disarmament issues. Revolutionary changes have taken place in the former Soviet Union, the "cold war" is over, and both we and the Americans have basically lost an adversary but are left with a pile of weapons, onerous military spending, and colossal armies. Yeltsin has confirmed that he is prepared to go even further along the disarmament path, and with even more determination than M. Gorbachev. This is important, because despite all the achievements of the last few years, the arms reduction talks have remained much as they were at the height of the "cold war"—an instrument for controlling the arms race, not a means of doing away with it altogether. They have been dragging on for years and have yielded minimal results. It now seems that things are on the move.

The Idea of Retargeting Missiles Is Unclear

Every idea has its prehistory. The Americans first put forward a proposal to remove cities from the list of strategic missile targets back in the days of McNamara. Even then the idea was regarded as dangerous.

Two doctrines exist—the countervailing doctrine (whereby cities are selected as targets) and the counterforce doctrine (whereby military installations are selected). Of course, it is immoral to select peaceful inhabitants as living targets, but it was precisely the countervailing doctrine that guaranteed stability and the preservation of peace. If just one capital is threatened by nuclear bombing, this is already an excessive price to pay for aggression and is therefore a weighty deterrent factor. But what if 10 or 100 cities are targeted? Therefore the countervailing doctrine, under the existing rules of the game, would not be a preventive strike but a warning or, to be more exact, a threat of retribution if the other side decides to use aggression.

In the case of the counterforce doctrine another logical chain is brought into play. Thus, it is a strike against military installations. But who needs to hit silos that are left empty once the missiles have been launched or communication and command centers that have already relayed all the essential commands? Targeting military installations makes sense when there are plans to inflict a preemptive or first strike rather than a retaliatory strike.

Moreover, when military installations are destroyed, it is necessary to be certain that the inflicted strikes have been effective. This means that more than one missile will be used on one target, i.e. a minimum of two or maybe more missiles will be used. In this case no arsenals will suffice, even those currently at the disposal of the United States and Russia.

In a word, the proposal was not thought through far enough. It seems that this has been realized, because twice already Yeltsin has spoken about removing U.S. military installations from the list of targets. Indeed, this is unambiguously a goodwill gesture. But for the time being nobody has answered the question of what to do with the nuclear might thus released; who will it be targeted on? Yeltsin has not given an answer to this question, which has caused concern throughout the world and even among CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] members, whom he has not consulted.

Moreover, does it take much time to retarget the missiles on their old targets, and, moreover, in such a way that nobody will know about it?

A Global System of ABM Defense—a Way of Putting the Brakes on Conversion

A global system of ABM defense makes no sense, just like its predecessor SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative]. The United States is citing new challenges as the justification for needing to work on its SDI program. Iraq, Libya, and some other states, in the Americans' opinion, are on the verge of developing [sozdaniye] their own nuclear weapons. But this is no argument. They may possess nuclear weapons, but in order for the threat of nuclear blackmail to become an urgent one that merits the SDI program, intercontinental ballistic missiles are still necessary. Without a developed industrial base, scientific potential, and tests, none of which can be kept secret, it is impossible to supply oneself with missiles.

It is more likely that the threat might come from terrorists who might either bring in a bomb in suitcases, throw one out of an aircraft, place one on a ship in a major port, or use this kind of thing as a means of blackmail. ABM defense is powerless against this sort of threat, but on the other hand it would undoubtedly lead to an increase in expenditure on the defensive arms race, which can only be in the interests of the U.S. and Russian military-industrial complexes.

For our military-industrial complex a space shield is also a pretext for putting the brakes on conversion. Arbatov does not rule out the possibility that our own defense complex may not have been uninvolved in the emergence of the idea of joining SDI. It is clear that the argument for trading weapons as a way out of the crisis in which the military industry finds itself arose in the same quarter.

With the end of the "cold war", the arms market is contracting sharply. We are not being given the chance to find ourselves a cozy position in this market, and most of our old clients never repaid their debts and are unable to do so. Moreover, trading in really expensive systems calls for the dispatch of technical specialists to service them. Events could subsequently develop in line with an already familiar scenario—military advisers will follow, which is a short step away from direct or indirect involvement in a conflict. The moral aspect is also important. A good name in politics is a great asset.

The Americans Will Not Share SDI Technology With Us

Hopes of jointly formulating a "space shield," Academician Arbatov is convinced, are groundless. The banning of U.S companies from participation in the laying of a fiber-optic telephone cable in Siberia is a rather revealing example. This stance should not be viewed as mistrust of Yeltsin or the Russian Government. The United States is afraid of our instability and fears that our scientists with their knowledge in the sphere of producing weapons of mass destruction will be tempted by good salaries in countries with dubious regimes. It would be unwise to supply them with state-of-the-art technologies suitable for ABM defense into the bargain.

The 1972 ABM Treaty Should Be Kept

The ABM Treaty, besides limiting the militarization of space, bans the placement of nuclear weapons in near-earth orbit and sets a lower limit to which both the United States and Russia can calmly reduce their nuclear capabilities. Under the treaty, each side is entitled to deploy up to 100 antimissile missiles. This means that in future we could reduce our arsenals of ballistic missiles on both sides to 100—or a few hundred at the outside—instead of the thousands we have at present. At any rate, for the time being we have not mutually abandoned the deterrence doctrine or proceeded to full nuclear disarmament.

If we review the treaty and raise the level of ABM defense, then there will be a corresponding rise in the lower arms threshold. To abandon a constraint like the ABM Treaty would be dangerous. The reduction of offensive nuclear weapons and ABM development are incompatible.

The Absence of a National Security Blueprint Is Not an Obstacle to Disarmament

As before, neither the United States nor Russia has a new national security blueprint. Radical changes have taken place. The old guidelines have gone, and an appraisal of what has happened is now under way. It is no surprise that inertial thinking is still creeping in on both sides of the Atlantic. Arbatov reminded me of the recent all-Army Assembly at which the following opinion was frequently voiced: The threat from outside remains. "How is this threat to be defined?" Arbatov asked. "Who wants to conquer us? Who would want to saddle themselves with our problems? Natural resources? But it is cheaper to buy them than to seize them by force. Nowadays war for the purpose of seizing something is absurd. Sources of raw materials and sales markets are won in another way—economically. The collapse of a number of sectors in the U.S. economy that cannot withstand Japanese competition is a vivid example of this."

Russia and the CIS have a sufficient margin of military-strategic strength to enable them to halve their arsenals and even repeat this operation several times and still be left with too much. There is work enough to last about 10 years, and during this time it is to be hoped that Russia and the CIS countries will formulate a new blueprint.

At the same time the threat to security still exists. Only now it is more a a threat from within. The establishment of the CIS is a first step on the road to strengthening our security. Careless words, a lack of attentiveness and respect for each other, and economic collapse are increasing the mistrust that divides us.

All the same, some parameters of the new blueprint are obvious: Nobody wants to attack, it is impossible to inflict a first strike, and the use of nuclear weapons even in a retaliatory strike is also suicidal. Open debate is needed to formulate a national security blueprint. The blueprint should be reviewed without any attempt to indulge the United States, which, Arbatov suspects, could happen in the event of a global ABM defense initiative.

Experts Find Out About the Initiatives From a Television Report

The West's suspicion that Russia's response to the U.S. proposals was a hastily formulated emergency measure is seemingly being confirmed. Although a member of the Consultative Committee under the Russian president, Georgiy Arbatov heard nothing about the foreign policy action that was being prepared. Neither he nor any of the experts he knows were enlisted to take part in discussing the proposals.

Moreover, nobody knows who the author of the proposals is. Information has filtered through from sources in foreign diplomatic missions in Moscow that the author is the young Russian Foreign Ministry diplomat Kozin. "If this is true, can questions like these really be resolved by bringing in one man, even if he is extremely intelligent?" Georgiy Arbatov said.

This system of making decisions must be changed immediately. In Academician Arbatov's opinion, this was a timely signal that all is not well in the system of administering affairs of state.

"If this is how decisions are made in the sphere of safeguarding security, then clearly things are similar in other spheres as well," he said. "In view of what is happening in the country as a result of Gaydar's reform, I am seriously beginning to believe that this is possible. Anonymity is unacceptable—it abolishes responsibility. Broad discussion of ideas among specialists, in parliament, and with an outlet to broad sections of the population, must become the rule. This is the why a number of aspects of the initiatives that have been put forward are annoyingly ill-conceived. If we make amendments, people will understand us. Everyone understands that we are going through a stage of establishing statehood."

IZVESTIYA got in touch with Russian Federation Foreign Ministry expert Vladimir Kozin. He denied being behind the formulation of the Russian initiatives put forward by B. Yeltsin. At the end of last year he prepared a background report on similar questions for Vice President Rutskoy. It is possible that this document was taken into account when the initiatives were formulated, but Kozin knows nothing about it.

So Kozin is not the author of the proposals that have caused so much fuss.

Results of Yeltsin Initiatives Still Unclear

924P0067A Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 7 Feb 92 First Edition p 3

[Article by observer Sergiy Demidov: "Moscow-Washington: The Hostility Is Over, Forget It. But the Guesswork in the 'Missile Thicket' Continues"]

[Text] It has long been shown repeatedly that diplomats' ink is easily erased if dusted with powder. To prevent this from happening on a world scale the president of Russia participated at the end of last week in the first top-level UN Security Council meeting in history and met with a number of Western leaders.

The official results of this, many foreign mass media believe possibly the most important, overseas tour in Boris Yeltsin's career, are well known. And they are rightly being described with positive epithets. After all, the Russian disarmament proposals, which provide, specifically, for a sharp lowering by both Moscow and Washington of the "plank" of nuclear deterrence to a level of 2,000- 2,500 nuclear warheads and the creation of a global system of protection from space against missile attacks, confirm that the declarations concerning the setting of the tense "cold war" era, which have been so frequent in recent days, are not an empty sound. They testify also that Russia is truly changing from the enemy which the ex-USSR was into an ally and partner of the West.

Understandably, such a metamorphosis automatically entails a change of political and diplomatic priorities and the "conditions" of the strategic missions confronting Russia as a state. But it by no means signifies that the former problems will be resolved of their own accord. For example, the Russian president announced that American cities would no longer be within Russia's nuclear sights. But in what direction will its missiles be retargeted? This question remained open even after a more than three-hour "unofficial exchange of opinions" between the Russian and American leaders at Camp David. Yet "weapons" problems as a whole and this one in particular were not the least important things during their discussions. Washington's response, however, was very evasive. What is clear from it is merely the fact that there is nothing of the kind in the Pentagon's plans. So both the political scientists and journalists will have to continue the guesswork in this "missile thicket."

True, responding to all this, U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney gave the assurance in an interview with NBC that "there has been a fundamental change in American strategy" also. According to him, "there has been a shift from a readiness to counter the old threat—a global war with the Soviet Union almost without prior warning—to a new strategy, in which the emphasis is put on regional conflicts of the kind which we recently encountered in the Persian Gulf."

Nonetheless, the two presidents could hardly have harmonized the proposals for a mutual reduction in missile

arsenals which they put forward last week "right off the bat" without upsetting the nuclear parity. And as a result, therefore, the leaders of Russia and the United States agreed to return to a discussion on control at the negotiations scheduled for March. The head of the American military department declared here that no one doubted the need for further reductions in nuclear arms.

He expressed highly diplomatically also the hope that Washington and Moscow would, possibly, find ways to cooperate in the creation of a general antimissile "shield" based on the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] "Star Wars" program, which the United States has been implementing for nine years now. But, as the newspaper CHICAGO TRIBUNE observed, Boris Yeltsin's idea of subscribing to this work contradicts his statement that Russia is a supporter of observance of the 1972 Soviet-American ABM Treaty.

It should be mentioned here that, according to information of THE WASHINGTON POST, the George Bush administration recently left this agreement off a list of arms control treaties which it is calling on the former Soviet republics to observe. "Many technical, economic, and political questions remain," this influential newspaper observes, "in respect to this project."

Questions remain, for that matter, in other spheres also. Thus French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, and other Western politicians also, are not entirely convinced of the dependability of the control of the nuclear potential of the ex-Union.

Particularly unpleasant sensations and negative emotions in the West are being evoked by the disagreements on this problem between republics of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]

Nuclear problems are also at the epicenter of the visit, currently under way, of the Russian president to France, which, as Francois Mitterrand emphasized, has received with interest the nuclear disarmament proposals advanced by Russia. An aide of his observed that the most important element of the negotiations was the concurrence of views on the question of defensive sufficiency or minimum deterrence. True, although, according to REUTERS, Boris Yeltsin did not appeal to the French side for it to cut its nuclear force, Paris hastened to give notice that it was not ready to make reductions.

Nonetheless, it is believed that there is agreement everywhere—Moscow and Paris, Kiev and Alma-Ata, Washington and Ottawa—on one thing: The history of tomorrow is being written by the ink of the diplomats conducting today's disarmament negotiations. So that no one ever takes it into his head to dust the world with "nuclear powder."

Proximity of U.S., Russian Arms Cuts Assessed

PM1902124192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Feb 92 Morning Edition pp 1, 5

[Report by Vladimir Mikheyev and Kim Smirnov: "Russia-United States: Agreement Being Reached More Quickly, Disagreements Being Formulated More Clearly. Search Is On for Acceptable 'Low Levels' With Regard to Nuclear Warheads. International Scientific Research Center Being Set Up To Support Scientists of Former USSR"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's two-day talks in Moscow were a gratifying manifestation of a new level of mutual understanding between the partners. At a joint news conference on 17 February Boris Yeltsin noted the proximity of the U.S. and Russian positions on the question of reducing strategic offensive arms. But "insignificant disagreements" remained. Which ones precisely?

At the recent Camp David meeting between the Russian and U.S. Presidents, George Bush did not rule out the possibility of further reductions in strategic offensive arms, further to his proposed level of 4,700 warheads. Russia advanced a counterproposal at that time—to lower the ceiling to 2,500 warheads. I will remind you that, according to data published by AP, the former Soviet Union has between 10,000 and 12,000 strategic warheads and 17,000 warheads on tactical delivery systems. The United States has 12,000 and 9,000 respectively. However, the Americans are prevented from cutting their arsenal to the Russian ceilings by the fact that "in this case the nuclear systems on submarines, with regard to which the United States has a clear advantage, will be affected" (AP).

Nevertheless, each side has already taken several steps toward the other. Russia has announced the ending of the production of its Tu-160 and Tu-95MS strategic bombers. The U.S. has promised to halt the assembly line for the B-2 strategic bomber.

The stumbling block today, according to REUTERS, is the formula for reducing strategic arms, according to which Russia will have to destroy its ground-launched heavy missiles with MIRV's—SS-18 missiles, in particular—while the U.S. will retain its superiority in terms of SLBM's.

There is not yet any evidence that the sides have managed to reach a mutual understanding on President B. Yeltsin's proposal to involve Russia in the creation of a global security system presupposing active participation in what has been called "global protection against limited (missile) strikes." In fact, Washington's acceptance of the idea of a partnership with Moscow in implementing the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program would signify the weightiest and most specific contribution to implementing the Camp David declaration, which speaks of the two countries' desire "not to regard

each other as potential partners" [as published] and to build relations on a basis of friendship, partnership, and trust.

One of the undoubted successes of the Moscow talks was the decision to set up an international scientific and technical center to support scientists and specialists of the former USSR. Its founding fathers are simultaneously the U.S., Russia, and Germany.

The international center is still at the planning and design stage. It will require major capital investment. A final estimate of the costs has not been determined. Nevertheless, it is known that the United States is allocating $25 million. It will also be possible to take advantage of a subsidy of $400 million approved by the U.S. Congress last year—these funds are earmarked to assist the former Soviet Union to destroy its nuclear arsenals. Germany, according to a statement by its embassy in Moscow, intends to enlist broad support for this project in the EC. According to preliminary data, the so-called technical aid fund totaling 50 million ECUs ($65 million) will be at the disposal of the center's creators.

Yevgeniy Velikhov, adviser to the Russian president, has reported that the international center will be located in the city of Troitsk, 32 km southwest of Moscow. Branches will be opened in Arzamas and Chelyabinsk.

How will the work of the new international scientific and technical center be organized?

Reply from Vyacheslav Pismennyy, director of Troitsk Institute of Innovative and Thermonuclear Research and corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences:

"Our institute is being proposed as the center's base, for it has accumulated considerable scientific potential, has created a modern infrastructure, and has experience in organizing large-scale scientific and technical developments in the sphere of high technologies such as controlled thermonuclear fusion, laser physics and technology, magnetohydrodynamic power generators, and others. We have close links with the I.V. Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute and other scientific centers of the Russian Federation Ministry of Atomic Power—the VNIIEF [expansion unknown] (Arzamas-16) and the VNIITF [expansion unknown] (Chelyabinsk-70)—and we also have good contacts at all levels with U.S. and German national laboratories.

"According to our ideas, the center, whose founders are the governments of the Russian Federation, the United States, and the FRG, will be headed by a council which will draw up scientific research programs on the basis of proposals from participating institutes on the Russian, U.S., and German sides. These programs could include nuclear sources of energy and nuclear safety; promising technologies and new materials; interaction between energy flows and matter; controlled thermonuclear fusion, and others. Current management of the center's activity will be implemented by a board through the directors of the corresponding programs."

New Initiative Program Cancels Projects

OW1902221692 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1848 GMT 19 Feb 92

[From the 20 February "Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In accordance with a new program for reducing strategic nuclear forces, Russia's military-industrial complex will cancel most projects for developing new strategic nuclear weapon systems and modernizing old ones. Russia will continue to develop only two missile systems in 1992-93: the SS-18 Satan heavy strategic carrier and the new SS-25 Sickle long-range mobile missile. Businesses and scientific research centers in the Russian military-industrial complex will have to stop work on the new SS-X-26 missile and the modernized AS-17 air-based cruise missile.

The SS-18 strategic intercontinental missile, which was first added to the Soviet military arsenal in the late 1960's, is still the cornerstone of the former USSR's nuclear military forces. The SS-18 is capable of carrying up to 10 separately-targeted military warheads (based on the MIRV [multiple indepedently targeted reentry vehicle] system), each having 100-300 kiloton potential. Information provided by specialists from the military-industrial complex reveals that this missile system must undergo thorough modernization, including the development of new launch mounts, engine modifications to reduce delivery time, and modernized electronic components for the targeting system. A new ABM [anti-ballistic missile] hardened warhead will also be developed. Experts feel that the project could take ten years and 18-25 billion rubles (at 1992 value) to complete.

The SS-25 missile system, analagous to the U.S. Midgetman, was developed in the mid-1970's. The Soviet system is noted for the fact that it is completely ready for mass production, while in 1990 the American system was still in the testing stages. The SS-25 system has hardened monoblock warheads based on trucks and railroad cars. Project developers project production of 200-300 SS-25's at the "Energy" military factories and perhaps at the Votkinsk factory, which used to produce SS-20's. Total cost for development and production of the navigation components was not disclosed.

'Unsanctioned Use' of Nuclear Storehouses Eyed

PM1902083592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Feb 92 p 2

[Article by Colonel O. Falichev "Military Observer's Notes": "Does Nuclear Terrorism Threaten Us?"]

[Text] The specific nature of my many years' work as an author in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's Rocket and Air Defense Forces Department has required me to travel

out to various missile units and to the Semipalatinsk and Novaya Zemlya test ranges, to delve into the problems of nuclear tests, and to talk with nuclear scientists. I have frequently seen for myself that diseases like radiophobia, which periodically roll over mankind like a rising tide, sometimes also arise because of an elementary lack of information or ignorance of the essence of the matter. The world has now been swamped by a wave of apprehension as to whether our nuclear weapons will spread over the earth. How valid is this?

The breakup of the USSR has upset the geopolitical balance of power that had evolved over decades. Whereas it was considered that two superpowers existed, now there is one left. How it will behave with regard to other countries—evidently time alone will tell. At present the world is anxious about something else: Are the nuclear weapons, scattered about four former republics of the USSR, in reliable hands? Has the possibility of their being purloined been ruled out? Finally, has the possibility of their unsanctioned use or of nuclear blackmail been ruled out?

There is no denying that these are serious questions which you cannot simply brush aside. This is not the first time they have arisen either. Let us recall: At first everyone was anxiously trying to guess which of us had his hand on the "nuclear button." Then the question of the fate of the missile launchers in Ukraine was placed on the agenda. Now there is the question of the possible sale of tactical nuclear weapons to Asian countries and even...to opposing forces in the Transcaucasus region. Italy's L'UNITA, for example, has reported that contraband deliveries of nuclear weapons and radioactive materials are being made to the Near East from our former Union republics. Long before that REUTERS had come up with a real sensation: Two African students had tried to send to the USSR equipment for the creation of nuclear devices, including weapons. It in fact turned out that all this was total conjecture.

It is all right when such "information" roams about the pages of many newspapers. But quite a few statements on this subject have been heard quite recently also from the lips of various politicians. French Defense Minister P. Joxe, for example, has voiced concern at the psychological maturity of our commanding officers responsible for tactical nuclear weapons. Y. Ne'eman, Israeli minister of energy, infrastructure, science, and technology, has also not failed to express his opinion and declared that the loyalty of the officer corps of the former Soviet Army, which belongs to no one, is not beyond doubt. Therefore there are suspicions that nuclear arms might start to disappear from storehouses. As though echoing him, even E. Shevardnadze has doubted the reliability of the guard on our arsenals and said that under conditions of chaos nuclear weapons could end up in the hands of paramilitary formations. It is not surprising that, following such massive "nuclear strikes," a debate has gotten under way in the United States and is still continuing as to whether the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] is capable of guaranteeing the security of its nuclear arsenal. This was discussed, in particular, also at the extraordinary session of the UN Security Council at the end of January. What can the answer be?

Of course, we thank the foreign gentlemen—those ministers—for their touching concern for the psychological health and loyalty of our officers. Now that the Army is being split up among national apartments, it really is not so easy to preserve tranquillity and mental equilibrium. But I have repeatedly seen for myself and I know now that, whatever political storms might fly over the country, missile men fulfill their duty worthily. This is the first guarantee that nuclear storehouses will not become thoroughfares.

But the fact remains that civil war is continuing in certain former republics of the USSR. Is it possible to guarantee nuclear security under such conditions? Has chance been ruled out? For the press has already emphasized repeatedly that we possess neither more nor less than 25,000 nuclear warheads and 10,000 carriers capable of delivering them to their targets. Are we capable of keeping each of these "toys" in our field of vision? Addressing news conferences and writing in the press, spokesmen for the CIS Armed Forces Main Commissariat, have repeatedly declared that there are no grounds for alarm and that chance occurrences have been ruled out. But man's makeup is such that he does not take everything at face value and tests many things with his teeth, as the saying goes, particularly since Chernobyl. Why must we heed the military and not trust Shevardnadze, let us say?

In this connection let us try to recall: What, in general, do we know about incidents involving nuclear weapons and their unsanctioned use? In November 1979 a computer in the NORAD command center (United States) signaled a nuclear missile attack by the USSR. Then strategic bombers received an order to inflict a counterstrike...But the computer's mistake was rectified in time. Pershing missiles have blown up in West Germany; B-52's have dropped nuclear bombs over Greenland and off the coasts of Spain. There was once a news flash relating to an unsuccessful attempt by a terrorist to seize a nuclear-powered submarine in America...During the period from 1950 through 1989, according to data of the CIS Armed Forces General Staff, there were 178 incidents involving nuclear weapons in the United States (43 accidents were accompanied by an explosion or ignition of an explosive charge forming part of a nuclear munition). There were approximately 170 in Britain. However, not one of these instances resulted in catastrophic consequences. They showed mercy, as it were.

Alas, similar "unpleasantnesses" have not bypassed us. In 1986 a missile with a nuclear warhead exploded in the silo of a nuclear-powered submarine in the region of the Bermuda Triangle. It was thrown out into the sea, but the warhead did not work. (I will say why a little later). There was a case when a similar submarine sank in the Pacific.

Everyone remembers the tragedy involving the submarine Komsomolets. This sad list could probably be continued, but the chief thing is that the accidents in our country, like the U.S. and British ones, did not result in nuclear catastrophes. As regards attempts to seize nuclear munitions, CIA Director William Webster reported last year that separatists in the Transcaucasus had attempted to seize a nuclear weapons dump but had been rebuffed. But the information turned out not to tally with reality. "There have not and could not have been such instances," Aviation Lieutenant General S. Zelentsov, deputy chief of a main directorate of the CIS Armed Forces Main Commissariat, categorically declared. "If only because there have long been no such weapons in 'hot spots': We have pulled them out."

Everything necessary was done in the past to ensure that nuclear weapons do not fall into the hands of terrorists and are not liable to be seized by fundamentalists or separatists in regions which in recent years have become the scene of mass disturbances and riots. In the Strategic Rocket Forces the guard on places where nuclear munitions are stored and on strategic missile positions has been reinforced, as reported by Army General Yu. Maksimov, commander of these forces. Similar measures have also been taken by the Rocket Forces and Artillery Staff of the Ground Forces. As regards "hot spots" and regions with an unstable political situation, tactical nuclear weapons have been moved from them to more "reliable" places. True, according to a report in THE EUROPEAN, this large-scale operation did not go unnoticed and was detected by Western intelligence departments. This, incidentally, confirms once again the highly professional work of our servicemen, their psychological fortitude, and, if you like, their loyalty.

What about the nuclear warheads—is it possible to steal them, let us say? Judge for yourselves. The warheads are kept at special storage bases, which are well guarded and carefully equipped against penetration by unauthorized persons. In particular, they are equipped with massive concrete shields and armored doors weighing many tonnes. The reliability of their storage is also ensured with the help of specially allocated modern means of electronic protection. So it is not easy to get into a storehouse and still less easy to remove a nuclear charge without a corresponding sanction. "Such a task, even if it occurs to someone's inflamed brain, is doomed to fail," Lt. Colonel N. Brylev, spokesman for military counterintelligence in one of the nuclear arsenals, told me.

But let us imagine the impossible: A nuclear munition has still ended up in the hands of a terrorist. Even in this case there will not be a nuclear explosion, as there are several degrees of protection against one (code-blocking devices). This was why there was no explosion of the missile with a warhead on our submarine in the Atlantic or when the nuclear bombs fell from the U.S. B-52's. However, chaos and political instability do not, alas, boost our optimism. For even ordinary damage to the covering of a nuclear munition or its deformation as the result of a blow can cause radioactive contamination with plutonium discharged into the atmosphere. This is not to mention the fact that acts of terror are possible in respect not only of nuclear weapons and their storage bases but also of nuclear electric power stations [AES's], of which there are more than enough in our country, and AES personnel. The experience and knowledge of nuclear scientists can also be utilized for the same improper purposes with the help of violence. Although this is a topic for a separate discussion, I believe that the problem of the "brain drain" and of protection for AES's remains topical not only for the CIS.

What does the situation primarily dictate in this connection? It must evidently be a question of reducing the nuclear arsenal to sensible limits and of its further utilization. As far as is known, the latter is an extremely complex, costly, and lengthy matter. Therefore, however much this offends national feelings, we obviously should not refuse the $400 million in aid being allocated for these purposes by the U.S. Congress. It will come in useful to set up workshops, for example, which will produce scrap metal, precious metals, chemical explosives, and other components. Or bases for the storage of weapons-grade plutonium. For, as has been reported, in the long term it is proposed to eliminate approximately 15,000 nuclear warheads. At the same time this number could increase if B. Yeltsin's new proposals for reducing strategic offenisve arms are adopted. I would just like to emphasize a detail of considerable importance, which politicians, to all appearances, do not always take into account. The amount that the Americans have offered us is a tiny proportion of what will be required for the large-scale reduction of nuclear arsenals. The main funds will ultimately have to be sought from our own taxpayers. Is a "disarmament race" which will add a new twist to our impoverishment of any benefit?

Furthermore, the process of getting rid of terrible weapons must definitely be a bilateral process and, when it comes right down to it, affect all nuclear powers. At one of the recent Soviet-U.S. consultations on nuclear disarmament it was reported that it is planned to begin work on eliminating and utilizing nuclear warheads in the United States in the first half of 1992. I would like to hope that this was not, figuratively speaking, a U.S. propaganda stunt. That in the present international situation the United States will finally exclude from its military doctrine the point about the possibility of making a first nuclear strike. Otherwise the monetary "gifts" of Congress could turn into gifts borne by Greeks.

If we are to speak of the international legislative base associated with this process, then we obviously must take account of Academician V. Goldanskiy's proposals on "transferring to Russia all the rights and obligations of the USSR under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty" and on consolidating its role in other very important international treaties that are mainstays of a guarantee against the threat of nuclear war. In them Russia, as was also the case with the USSR, must have the right to veto any amendments.

The "Agreement on Joint Measures in Respect of Nuclear Weapons," signed by B. Yeltsin, L. Kravchuk, N. Nazarbayev, and S. Shushkevich, states that our sovereign states pledge "not to transfer nuclear weapons or other explosive nuclear devices and technologies to anyone whatever." The strict fulfillment of this agreement will also guarantee the nuclear security of the CIS countries and the world community. But the chief guarantee, I believe, still lies elsewhere. It lies in you and me. In the desire of everyone together and of each one individually to comprehend and understand the realities of the new life and the prospects being opened up for us by peaceful coexistence and the abandonment of the creation of the image of the enemy. We have hardly realized this fully, but we are, I would like to believe, on the threshold of very great changes. What is needed to make them irreversible is goodwill and the desire to find joint paths to the truth not through blood and violence but through peace and concord.

Republics' Locations of Nuclear Materials Eyed

924P0066A Moscow MEGAPOLIS EKSPRESS in Russian No 2, 9 Jan 92 p 22

[Article by Sergey Morgachev: "Plutonium Is a Friend, But Truth Is More Costly"]

[Text]**Along with their independence the republics have received as their property many objects involved in the nuclear production cycle. In addition, they have on their territories both strategic nuclear weapons (Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus) and tactical nuclear weapons, whose locations remain a state secret. The agreement on joint measures on nuclear weapons signed by the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] countries on 21 December by no means resolved all the problems.**

The disintegration of the Soviet Union first of all raised with great urgency the question of where and in whose hands tactical land-based nuclear weapons would be. The arsenal of tactical missiles on the territory of the USSR now includes the SCUD-B (at the beginning of 1991 there were 661 launchers and 1,370 warheads), the FROG-7 (370 and 1,450), and the SS-21 (300 and 310). The most modern weapon is the SS-21, put into service in 1978. Before the start of the catastrophic disintegration of the USSR, tactical missile weapons were deployed at least in the Belorussian, Transcarpathian, Kiev, Odessa, and Turkestan Military Districts, and, of course, in Russia. Western military sources also registered sites where nuclear-capable tactical air forces were based. We are talking about the MiG-27 fighter-bomber (725 aircraft), the Su-17 (600), and the Su-24 (875). Each of them can carry one or two nuclear bombs; the arsenal of those bombs totaled about 2,500 at the beginning of 1991. In addition to Russia, these types of aircraft were deployed in the Belarussian, Transcarpathian, Kiev, Odessa, Transcaucasus, and Turkestan Military Districts.

With respect to nuclear artillery shells, mines, and air defense missiles, and also naval weapons, information on their location never percolated beyond the military establishment. But it was possible to assume with a very high degree of probability that they were deployed in most military districts. This was essentially confirmed in December 1990 by Marshal Akhromeyev, who stated the following: "Tactical nuclear weapons are deployed in virtually all the Union republics." The top military leadership had for a long time preferred to admit nothing officially, nor deny anything, assuring everyone (as, for example, Marshal Shaposhnikov has) that "the nuclear button is in reliable hands" and that no one "at the local level" can lay claim to this. Even until very recently we were aware only of the statement issued late in 1990 by the commander of the Transcaucasus Military District that there were no nuclear or chemical weapons on the territory of the district. The agreement on joint measures with respect to nuclear weapons finally stated officially that tactical nuclear weapons were located in Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, and it was made a mandatory obligation for them to ensure their withdrawal into Russia by 1 July 1992 for dismantling. But the fate of tactical nuclear weapons on the territories of other Commonwealth countries remains unclear.

Another layer of the problem of nuclear safety arising as the result of the breakup of the state is connected with the component parts of the nuclear military cycle and the nuclear fuel cycle ending up in the hands of the now independent republics, and this is a cause for legitimate concern in the international community.

The uranium mines and the plants that produce uranium concentrate are located in Russia (the Urals, and Krasnokamensk in Chita Oblast), in Ukraine (Kirovograd Oblast, Zheltyye Vody), Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan (Yangi-Abad), Kyrghyzstan (Tonskiy Bay at Issyk-Kul, Kadzhi-Say, Min-Kush, and Tyuyamuyun), Tajikistan (Taboshar), and Estonia.

All the uranium-enrichment capacities for power purposes are located in the Russian Federation (production of highly enriched uranium for military needs was halted in 1989). Production of plutonium for military purposes is also concentrated in Russia—Chelyabinsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Tomsk—as is the production of the munitions themselves (the most well-known facility is Arzamas-16 in Nizhegorod Oblast). According to Western figures, at the beginning of 1989 weapons-grade plutonium was being produced by 14 reactors, of which at least five (this is now according to Soviet figures) have been closed down.

As is known, however, plutonium is formed as the result of the reaction in power and research reactors...Soviet nuclear power stations [AES] using channel-type graphite moderated reactors and pressurized water reactors are less "productive" from the standpoint of the plutonium produced than, for example, reactors employing heavy water as the moderator. All reactors designed to generate electric power, however, produce

plutonium contaminated with the isotope Pu-204, while usually, for the manufacture of nuclear weapons almost pure Pu-239 is used. But in principle even this is no obstacle to the use of exhausted fuel for military purposes; true, capacities are then needed to separate the plutonium from it. In addition to Russia, AES are located in Lithuania (the Ignalinskaya AES), and Ukraine (the Rovenskaya, Yuzhno-Ukrainskaya, Zaporozhskaya, and Khmelnitskaya AES). A statement of intent has been issued to re-open the Armyanskaya AES. At Shevchenko on the Mangyshlak peninsula (Kazakhstan) the USSR's first industrial fast-neutron breeder reactor is located; it operates both as an AES and as a water distillation plant, and as a producer of plutonium for subsequent use in power breeder reactors. In the future this reactor itself should be switched to use plutonium fuel...

As far as research reactors outside Russia are concerned, they are functioning in Tashkent, Kiev, Tbilisi, Riga, Minsk, and Alma-Ata and they belong to institutes of the republic academies of sciences. The facilities in Tashkent, Tbilisi, Riga, and Minsk use 90 percent enriched uranium, that is, they are immediately suitable for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. From the standpoint of facilities for producing plutonium the capacities of these reactors are significant, and the reactors at Tashkent, Kiev, and Alma-Ata, which are in the 10-20 megawatt range, are quite powerful research facilities. One of the most "sensitive" materials from the standpoint of production of nuclear material is so-called heavy water (D2O). It is reported that the Agrokhimservis company, which is engaged in the export of this product, is now the only functioning plant producing it; it is located at Dneprodzerzhinsk (Ukraine). However, it is generally thought in the world that our capacities for producing heavy water are much more significant. For example, in an article published recently in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, the director of the Center for Russian and Soviet Studies in Monterey (United States), Potter, writes that major capacities for the production of heavy water and the smelting of beryllium and zirconium (which are also essential for the production of nuclear weapons) are located in republics where Muslim populations predominate. As far as zirconium is concerned, according to other Western information it is also recovered in Ukraine.

The republics of the former USSR have received a quite dangerous nuclear legacy. The 21 December agreement between the member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States obligated Ukraine and Belarus to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty as nonnuclear states. But the nuclear status of Kazakhstan and other Commonwealth of Independent States member states, except for the Slav republics, must be shaped according to all international rules. Their signing of the nonproliferation treaty and agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency would, however, be impossible at the present time.

'Centralized Super Storage' Facility Proposed

924P0066B Moscow MEGAPOLIS EKSPRESS in Russian No 2, 9 Jan 92 p 22

[Article by Pavel Kolesnikov: "We Are Turning the Urals Into a Model Nuclear Storage Facility"]

[Text] **The Soviet nuclear potential (both military and "peaceful") is now the focus of attention in the domestic and foreign press. Who will have the strategic missiles and tactical warheads located on the territories of the new sovereign states? Many people really fear that an exchange of missile strikes between the fraternal republics will lead to full-scale nuclear civil war that will destroy not only the new-born independent states but the entire planet. Or at least all of the northern hemisphere, thus resolving the North-South confrontation.**

The influential democratic senator Sam Nunn (chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee) has summed up the situation as follows: "Either we achieve in the very near future the greatest reduction of nuclear weapons in the history of mankind or there will be an unforeseeable proliferation of nuclear weapons, fissionable materials, and nuclear technologies. For even if the former Soviet republics do not engage in nuclear civil war they may start to sell surplus weapons and export nuclear technologies, while hungry engineers from defense plants take advantage of the emigration laws and set off to work in 'southern' countries, where nuclear weapons may soon be as commonplace as Kalashnikov automatics."

This threat has seemed so real to American legislators that both the Senate and the House of Representatives voted in late November to allocate $400 million to help the USSR (Commonwealth of Independent States) to dismantle warheads. It is quite possible that this will be only a first installment. American taxpayers may soon become the main source for real funding for the Soviet defense industry, which is totally unprepared to assimilate the many billions of capital investments in disarmaments on the same scale and with the same efficiency as in earlier years, when money was allocated by the party and government for the arms race.

The deputy minister of atomic energy and industry, Viktor Mikhaylov, who is responsible for defense matters in the activity of the nuclear department, recently chaired a Soviet-American seminar in Kiev attended by many American nuclear (military) experts from Livermore and other laboratories, which substantiated a plan to use the American millions. It is being proposed that all $400 million be used to build a centralized super storage facility in the Urals to store pure (weapons-grade) plutonium. (The exact location of the new construction site of the century is still secret so as not to scare the local population beforehand.)

The huge stock of plutonium produced by Soviet nuclear power workers is truly dangerous: This element is radioactive and it could be seized by criminals for the purpose of blackmail, and—the most important thing—it is

extremely toxic. Most weapons-grade plutonium is "installed" in warheads and is held by the military. If mass dismantling of warheads really does start in the near future (with the tactical warheads first), then the plutonium will again be in the hands of those who at one time produced it, receiving orders and awards and titles for so doing. The problem of reliable storage (for millions of years while it is still decaying) or controlled use (fast-neutron reactors, power elements on deep space stations, and so forth) must somehow be resolved.

The dense cloud of secrecy that covers all details of the Soviet nuclear program, however, does not make it possible to judge with any degree of certainty which disarmament programs will be the best. Is it necessary to build a new centralized super storage facility at a new site or re-equip facilities already existing for this purpose more cheaply and more simply (including Arzamas-16, for example)? The Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry has already set up the well-known Atommash in the Don steppe, but the incomplete complex, to which it was necessary to ship a stream of material from nuclear reactors, has been sinking into the ground in the literal sense of the word.

Moreover, the Soviet defense industry has already put forward an alternative project to eliminate both nuclear and chemical weapons by means of underground nuclear explosions. They say that all that is necessary to blow them up. However, the desire of any normal expert to ensure the future of his own profession is quite understandable and since there are no other experts, society must listen to those who are there, and as a result nuclear disarmament will inevitably require a further buildup in the nuclear industry. For apart from the weapons themselves, which fortunately are not too radioactive, there is still the unresolved problem of radioactive waste from the nuclear industry, nuclear power engineering, and the reactors aboard nuclear-powered submarines. Whereas production of weapons-grade plutonium has now virtually ceased for all practical purposes, it is not possible to close down the nuclear power stations [AES].

Under conditions in which the recovery of energy resources is falling and their delivery to consumers is becoming increasingly unreliable for economic and political reasons, nuclear power engineering remains the only reliable source of energy in many of the "independent" regions. Lithuania cannot abandon the Ignalinskaya AES, and Ukraine will probably be forced to continue operation of the Chernobyl AES, while in Armenia they are seriously thinking about restarting the Armyanskaya AES.

However, the new independent states are incapable of independently using (or even independently eliminating) nuclear facilities inherited as a legacy from the USSR. Of the 15 independent states, only Russia is a real nuclear power. The rest are more like nuclear hostages. Only Ukraine could in principle achieve nuclear status, and even that would be in the quite distant future (if an appropriate program were adopted and monstrous sums of money were spent); nuclear status assumes totally independent production (and testing) of nuclear weapons and means to deliver them. This, however, would be at variance with its pledges under the terms of the recent agreement on joint measures with respect to nuclear weapons.

Those weapons that are now located in the republics can be removed at any moment (evacuation of tactical weapons has already started). Strategic weapons systems, which it is difficult to remove (ICBM's in silos), cannot be used in interrepublic conflicts because they are targeted on the NATO countries (first and foremost the United States). Although it is theoretically possible to change the targeting, it is in principle impossible to reduce their range down to tactical ranges.

No uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons is taking place; it is simply that instead of the USSR as a nuclear superpower, Russia has emerged as a superpower. Civil (interrepublic) nuclear war (a "nuclear Yugoslavia") seems most improbable under these conditions. Moreover, the dependence of nuclear power engineering facilities and the nuclear industry on centralized supplies ties the independent republics even more firmly to Russia (they cannot count on help from the West because the Soviet reactors are unique). And this dependence will not disappear in the foreseeable future. It is necessary to think that an interrepublic atomic department will be set up (essentially it already exists) that will establish reliable centralized control over all nuclear facilities on the territory of the former USSR, and also over exports of nuclear technologies to third countries. This kind of control agency may turn out to be even more important than a joint command for strategic forces.

For 45 years nuclear weapons maintained the peace in Europe, preventing the cold war from becoming a hot war. The Soviet tank armies did not move to the Rhine, and the West did not intervene in 1956 in Hungary, nor in 1968 in Czechoslovakia. It is quite possible that now, within the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] nuclear weapons (or, more exactly, the threat of their use) may also help to dampen (if not prevent) quite probable interrepublic armed conflicts. True, in Europe there was a nuclear balance, while in the CIS, Russia dominates in the nuclear field, but this kind of structure may also be stable enough.

'Full Public Control' Urged for Disarmament

PM1702163792 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Feb 92 pp 1,4

[Report by Vladimir Gubarev: "If You Have Bought an Atomic Bomb, Destroy It!"]

[Text] The myths, rumors, scandal, and speculation surrounding nuclear weapons are increasing every day. Hardly had the "nuclear brain drain" sensation faded, even though not one of the creators of the weapon has left to work abroad, than fresh "top-secret" information

hit the newspaper pages: The Japanese are ready to buy up all the weapons-grade plutonium and "quickly reprocess it for the needs of the nuclear power industry, thus freeing themselves from the need to import oil and fuel." For information's sake, at the moment there are no effective techniques available for reprocessing weapons-grade plutonium, there is only research work and nothing else to speak of.

The politicians are not being left behind here, either. The Russian President's sensational statement on retargeting missiles away from U.S. cities has generated a host of bewildered questions: So where will they be aimed? But even that is not the main issue—unfortunately the president's advisers are making B. Yeltsin say the kind of things that cannot be carried out. That is why in Geneva the Russian Foreign Minister had to explain that the president has only put forward an idea, "launched a trial balloon, whereas in fact everything is far more complex." The air above the planet is quite thick with "nuclear trial balloons." J. Attali, president of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, has proposed that the USSR's debts be written off in exchange for our destroying our nuclear warheads. A figure has even been mentioned: $60 billion. A generous gift, is it not? But if you take a closer look at nuclear disarmament problems, you will see that statements of this kind are mere declarations.

To destroy the vast arsenal of nuclear weapons stockpiled in the world will cost money—lots of it! Perhaps only slightly less than it took to create the weapons. The $400 million which the Pentagon is promising are surely only enough to build a single storage facility. So let us not be deceived by the politicians' various statements—we are still a very long way from real disarmament, the pace of nuclear weapons production remains high, and we still have not seen with our own eyes a single nuclear charge being dismantled and destroyed.

Furthermore, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union a danger has arisen not so much of the "leak of nuclear technologies" that people are talking about so much as of a slackening of control over the nuclear monster. The "voyages" of nuclear charges from Ukraine and Belarus to Russia, the absence of secure depots, and finally the complete unpreparedness for the dismantling and storage of warheads on such a scale all sharply reduce nuclear safety. Even though the military are trying to avoid publicity because they fear the public, some information on the inauspicious situation is getting through. And we learn about this "from abroad." They are not letting us, their own country's journalists, have access, arguing that everything in this sphere is classified. Whereas for U.S. specialists the doors of the most closed installations are suddenly flung wide open. Recently some visitors from across the ocean visited a tactical nuclear weapons dump (they were invited to "one of the best"). The Americans were horrified at what they saw!

I am deeply convinced that nuclear disarmament must be under full public control. Moreover, with the public's most active participation, financing included. Let us not harbor any illusions: The Russian leadership, like the U.S. Administration, does not now have the means to implement its planned programs. And if the government's attitude toward nuclear physicists does not change in the very near future, there will simply be no one left to carry out nuclear disarmament. In the press and on television, both at home and abroad, there are reports that the threat of unemployment hangs over "Chelyabinsk-70," "Arzamas-16," and other nuclear centers in Russia and that physicists will be reduced to "beggary" and "starvation." They are even collecting humanitarian aid for them in the United States and Europe and some charitable foundations are prepared to "pay them extra in freely convertible currency." In my view, everything has been turned upside down in the present situation. In fact, there are no financial centers. Yes, specialists' pay is miserly by present-day standards. Yes, the solution of the fate of our atomic ministry has been delayed and there is a bureaucratic fuss being created over the appointment of a leader for the new department. All these things are true. And this is the nuclear physicists' calamity.

It is a great good fortune that specialists have an incredible degree of self-restraint—none of them has left and collectives have not disintegrated because people, unlike the government, understand very well how great the responsibility resting on them is—above all for the world's nuclear safety. Specialsts such as those employed at "Arzamas-16," for example, will have no particular difficulty finding work. Any of our firms will pay them just as much as they will earn abroad. But if the designers and engineers from the nuclear centers leave there will be problems for the government and the peoples of Russia because they are the only ones capable of dismantling and neutralizing the nuclear charges. Pray God that this principle is not breached: Then we will not only have Chernobyl and Kyshtym on our land, there will also be Russian Hiroshimas and Nagasakis.

The public has held out a helping hand—we have decided to enlist private capital in disarmament. The "nuclear auction" project (see PRAVDA for 14 and 28 December 1991) envisages the destruction of actual nuclear charges and the financing is to be carried out by firms and concerns, private individuals and social organizations.

The first to approve the draft were specialists themselves, whom some mass media are calling "blind hawks." It is they who prepared the plan for dismantling the charges and bombs in such a way that the whole process could be displayed to the public at large and at the same time prevent a leak of information—the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons must be observed in full and in all respects! The International Federation of Peace and Accord, the M. Gorbachev Foundation, the concern headed by M. Bocharov, the "Doveriye" firm, 20 enterprises and organizations belonging to the "Neizvestnyy kosmodrom" joint-stock company, the small-scale enterprise "Vityaz," the

"Nekos" RIA [expansion unknown], plants in the Urals, combines in Kazakhstan, and many of our readers are ready to take part most actively in implementing this project.

The Western firms about which we have already reported ("Lare" from Italy, the "Kuzin Grupp Interneyshnl" from Austria, and Khink [company names as transliterated] from the United States) are being joined by others. On the eve of the auction for the right to destroy the first nuclear charges (and we are sure: it must take place!) we will publish a complete list of participants. It seems to me that the general mood was captured by the president of an Indonesian goldminers' concern, whose letter we received yesterday.

"Recently we learned about your program for the destruction of nuclear weapons, known as 'I am buying a nuclear warhead.' The idea expressed recently by Austrian Chancellor Vranitzky on the acquisition of weapons in the CIS countries and their subsequent destruction caught our attention by its extraordinary nature and profound common sense.

"Having analyzed the firm's financial potential and counting on the earliest and fullest destruction of nuclear weapons not only in the countries of the former socialist camp but throughout the world, our Indonesian goldminers' concern has decided to acquire a few warheads from the most destructive Soviet missiles, the SS-17, SS-18, SS-19, and SS-22. In our view it would be sensible to begin with the destruction of the latest warheads, including mobile forward-based systems, intermediate-range, and ICBM's.

"The firm's board is ready to use up to 14.5 percent of net profit for the above mentioned purposes, amounting to several billion U.S. dollars.

"We hope that the successful implementation of this program will help to strengthen peace and rid mankind of the threat of its total destruction as quickly as possible."

Interesting, is it not? In far-off Indonesia, Australia, and South America, from where we also received evidence of a desire to take part in the "nuclear auction," people are attentively following events connected with disarmament in one-sixth of the world. Furthermore, they are ready to come to our aid. But so far the answer has been silence because some people are still convinced that the best, correct ideas originate only within the Kremlin's walls.

Experts View Flaws in Arms Export Policy

PM1702135992 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 92 p 3

[Article by A. Khokhlov: "Tank Attack on the Market: Military Experts on Prospects for the Sale of Russian Weapons"]

[Excerpts] It seems that a method capable of enabling us to overcome the crisis has been found. The superpower used to produce countless quantities of tanks, planes, and ballistic missiles, which were the equal of the best in the world. [passage omitted]

The place in the market vacated by us is now being actively fought over, on the one hand, by Austria, Israel, Switzerland, and Sweden, and on the other by Brazil, Singapore, and South Korea. The former have managed to create powerful military-industrial complexes of their own, the latter are producing tanks under license. In 10 years the Brazilians have sold weapons worth $4.5 billion. But both the former and the latter are being pressured by China and North Korea.

In short, it is a bazaar in which Russia today, with its sales of weapons worth $4 billion (in 1986 prices) instead of the pre-perestroyka $18 billion, looks like Cinderella selling violets. However, there is an opportunity to rectify the material position.

Here is what Sergey Akimov, a military expert and staffer of the Central Institute of Military Technical Information, says:

According to Western estimates, the Near East countries' total demand for military imports in 1992-1995 could reach $127.4 billion. Admittedly, most of the countries of that region are militarily oriented toward the United States, France, and Britain. But it is possible to compete for contracts.

In the opinion of leaders of the Russian Industry Ministry, we can sell weapons worth $15 billion-$30 billion a year. But will we be able to?

There are at least two problems: political and economic.

The former confrontation between the USSR and the United States could be viewed any way you like but it did have an undoubted plus: Geostrategic equilibrium was maintained in the world. If the USSR supplied a consignment of MiG's to India, the United States hurried to sell Phantoms to Pakistan, and vice versa—across the world.

The Americans are using our present weakness to their advantage, which has already led to an imbalance. Future Russian expansion in the arms market threatens to make the process uncontrollable. Especially since in our country they are prepared to farm out the arms trade to the producers.

Yuriy Malkov, a military expert and a staffer of the Central Institute of Military Technical Information, gives his view:

The U.S. Congress adopts a law on each major contract. In Russia there is no law yet on weapons trading at all. There are so many people responsible for the preparation and conclusion of contracts: the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Armed Forces Main Commissariat, the Foreign Ministry, the Russian Industry Ministry.

The procedure for issuing licenses has not been worked out. Enterprises in the military-industrial complex left without state funding and under lax state control will undoubtedly seek to enter the world market. But through whom will they do that? Only through intermediary firms which could tomorrow sell weapons in the world's trouble spots, which now include republics of the former Union, too. I do not think that the West will choose to ignore that.

Military expert Sergey Akimov:

Military-industrial complex plants will inevitably begin to compete among themselves and drive down prices. Furthermore, being ignorant of market conditions they will lower their prices any way. Probably the United States and Europe will resort to antidumping measures: They will completely shut off our access to the market. Arms trading must remain the prerogative of the state.

Purchasers are also demanding state guarantees of us today. Recently there was a scandal: A military plant "directly" promised to supply several planes to a country. When the time came to dispatch the consignment it turned out that the aircraft were... still not ready.

The main problem facing the export of Russian weapons is this: What can we sell? It is impossible to send output straight off the production line or sell batch-produced models. Even the most impoverished Third World country will demand a tank or antitank guided missile in export version. Just to "convert" the instrument panel in a MiG cockpit from Russian to Arabic, for example, will cost 2.5 billion rubles. The Russian Government is not averse to receiving hard currency for military-industrial complex output but has refused to finance it.

The only things that we can sell quickly and with no problems now are firearms and ammunition.

Military expert Sergey Akimov [repetition as published]:

Of course, we can sell tanks, too, but only at scrap metal prices....

Incidentally, this is not the worst option. After the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe, the United States sold 600 tanks to Egypt at the price of transporters. This was the right thing to do. Reducing a tank to scrap metal costs more than the metal itself is worth. Unfortunately, Russia has opted for scrapping....

While repenting of past mistakes, let us not commit new ones. When the USSR sold weapons it showed scant concern for long-term maintenance programs. The United States took and still takes a different path: One-third of U.S. arms exports take the form of services. As a rule, the United States sells Phantoms as a "package" with the construction of airfields and the training of air and ground crews and specially stipulates the sale of spares. Such contracts are considerably more advantageous than one-off sales.

Our practice (both past and present) was to sell and forget. Thousands of firms have been making a good living out of our "forgetfulness." Britain's Royal Ordnance company developed and produces 105 mm guns for our T-55 and T-60 tanks, and the world is full of them. British Aerospace is beginning to supply MiG spares to Hungary. One can only guess at the "dog fight" that is now going on over supplies of spares to India. Some 80 percent of its army is equipped with our hardware....

We have no panaceas. But there is no reason to stop exporting weapons. All that we can sell today is oil and tanks. Will that be enough?

Footnote: The Central Institute of Military Technical Information, which has a unique store of information and experienced cadres, is now under the threat of a 35-percent reduction...

Nuclear Free Zone Set Up With U.S. City

LD1902230192 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1826 GMT 19 Feb 92

[From the "Military News" section]

[Text] Khabarovsk—In Ulcha district of Khabarovsk area and American city of Homer (Alaska), the first Russian-American nuclear-free zone is being set up. As Boris Kotelevskiy, administration head of Ulcha district center, told PF [POSTFACTUM] on February 19, setting up of the nuclear-free zone means prohibition of nuclear reactors' work, nuclear waste transportation, any nuclear facilities siting, or nuclear ammunition deployment at the territory of Ulcha district. In Kotelevskiy's words, the agreement was signed in connection with the recently started designing of the Far Eastern nuclear power station at the territory of Khabarovsk area, as well as in connection with reductions in nuclear arms in troops of the Far Eastern military district. Kotelevskiy also said that at present, there are no nuclear facilities or arms in Ulcha district. The agreement between twin places, i.e. Ulcha district and the city of Homer, on setting up of the Russian-American nuclear-free zone was signed on February 1st in the district center, village of Bogorodskoye. On March 11, the question of ratification of the agreement is planned to be discussed at a session of the Ulcha District Soviet.

Further Details on Submarine Collision

Engaged in 'Collecting Data'

LD1902185992 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Text] A U.S. Navy spokesman has admitted that the submarine Baton Rouge, which collided with a CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] submarine in the Barents Sea near the Russian coast on 11 February, was carrying out intelligence tasks, being engaged in collecting data about naval activity at sea and ashore in the area of Russia's naval bases on the Kola peninsula. This was reported by THE WASHINGTON POST, quoting information from a senior Navy officer who did not wish to be named. This senior officer added: The Cold War may have ended, but the Russian Navy continues to deploy both missile submarines and strike submarines, and for this reason we intend to continue tracking them and collecting intelligence data.

Unfortunately, our naval representatives are not disclosing details about this incident. All they have said is that we dispute the Americans' claim that the collision took place in territorial waters.

In the end, it is of course not a matter of whether this occurred one mile inside our territorial waters or a mile further. There are a few questions worth pondering here. On the one hand, it is a good thing that neither of the sides is dramatizing the incident, but shutting one's eyes to it would also be incorrect. The question arises as to what the Americans were doing in the immediate vicinity of our base. And this question, of course, cannot fail to require a precise and clear reply.

Of late both our President Boris Yeltsin and U.S. President George Bush have been talking a great deal about the fact that we have passed from confrontation to partnership. We are even speaking of relations as allies, but it would not be a bad thing to back up fine words with specific deeds. I understand that, for the time being, all these words are at the stage of declarations and intentions, but such incidents call these declarations and intentions very much into question. And therefore, in my view, it would be useful for both sides now to refrain from such actions, which are fraught with the risk of dangerous incidents.

Navy Press Center Responds

LD1902181392 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1654 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow, 19 February (TASS)—The collision of a Northern Fleet atomic submarine with the U.S. submarine "Baton Rouge" occurred in Russia's territorial waters whose borders in the Barents Sea are determined by Russian legislation. The ITAR-TASS correspondent was told about this at the Commonwealth of Independent States Navy press center today. The reference line for determining territorial waters in the area of the incident passes between the Cape of Tzypnavolok and the island of Kildin, and their outer border is 12 miles from this line. Up to now this ruling has not been disputed by any state, including the United States. So, the collision took place in our waters, 4.7 miles from their outer borders. The U.S. Navy Department does not want to admit this fact. It believes that the collision point lies outside Russian territorial waters, 14 miles off the coast.

In the opinion of Navy experts, there were several causes of the collision, including a gross violation of territorial waters by a foreign submarine, and its unsanctioned trespassing in a test area for the Northern Fleet's combat training, where it had spent about two hours, as well as its attempt at shadowing our submarine.

The collision took place at a moment when our submarine started active maneuvering before surfacing and the U.S. submarine lost contact with it. The commander of the "Baton Rouge" made a decision to rise to periscope depth to ascertain the situation. Both submarines found themselves in the so-called dead zone and could not hear each other. The assertion by the American seamen to the effect that their submarine was travelling on a 270-degree course sounds doubtful since that would mean that they were heading through the Kola Peninsula, the representative of the Navy press center said.

Pentagon on Collision

LD1902171992 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] A U.S. submarine operated by the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] collided in the Barents Sea in the Arctic Circle on February 11, Bob Hall, representative of U.S. Department of Defense, reported on Tuesday [18 February]. He said the U.S. submarine, the Baton Rouge, was at periscope depth when it was hit by the surfacing CIS submarine. Asked how it was possible that two modern naval ships with sophisticated accoustic equipment failed to avoid collision, the Pentagon spokesman said that submarines are usually striving to avoid detection.

The Pentagon representative said the incident happened in the Barents Sea which is in the international waters outside the 12-mile zone. The ASSOCIATED PRESS noted there were no reports about radioactive contamination in the are where the submarines collided.

The Pentagon representative refused to say who was to blame for the collision. He said that the U.S. submarine had not been damaged and no one of the crew had been hurt. The investigation of the circumstances of the

collision by representatives of the U.S. Navy continues, and the damage to the submarine would be assessed upon its return to Norfolk.

He said the incident was discussed during U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's conversation with Russian President Boris Yeltsin. Hall said it was a candid discussion.

The incident in the Barents Sea will not be an obstacle to the establishment of cooperation in the military area between Moscow and Washington. The spokesman said he would not predict what measurs can be taken. He said it was not very pleasant to witness such incidents but they do happen from time to time of which both sides are aware.

U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney touring Central American countries told reporters he was not surprised at the incident in the Barents Sea and saw no reason to alter operations of the U.S. Navy. He said several submarines are involved in these operations, that they are an important element of U.S. security, and he has no reason to believe that there is some fundamental problem requiring changes in the U.S. policy.

Policy Issues Underlying Baker Tour Examined

PM1402155192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Feb 92 Morning Edition pp 1,7

[Article by Stanislav Kondrashov: "James Baker—Coordinator in CIS?"]

[Text] Washington is taking on board in a professional way the new geopolitical reality called the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]. And in its diplomacy it seems to be more effective and thorough than the Russian leadership, which was the main creator of this reality. That is the impression given by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's current tour of CIS capitals.

Kishinev, Yerevan, Baku, Ashkhabad, Dushanbe, Tashkent (after an overnight in Chelyabinsk), and Moscow—all in a week. This is the kind of pace that "Iron Jim" is used to—he has "outflown" even his most nomadic predecessors. Given that, even after the proclamation of the Commonwealth, Baker had visited the capitals of its nuclear participants—Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, Alma-Ata, and Bishkek—he has now "covered" all 11 new states. The only one missed out was Tbilisi, but, first, Georgia is not a CIS member and, second, the boycott of Tbilisi—most probably temporary—is a reflection of Washington's dissatisfaction with the state of Georgian democracy.

In his blanket coverage of the CIS the U.S. secretary of state has surpassed not only his British and French colleagues, but even the Russian foreign minister, who has not made such trips. This fact reflects the comparative state of affairs: The well-organized state machinery of the surviving superpower and the chaos of reorganization and improvisation in the higher echelons of power of our shrunken fatherland. There is a somewhat more mundane observation to be made in this respect. Baker has been taking with him a selected group of correspondents, accredited to the State Department, to provide the necessary worldwide coverage of the visit. We in Moscow remain in the dark, since we have no diplomatic correspondents at "local level." And there is no regular system for sending information between the Commonwealth capitals. The Russian Foreign ministry amicably says that Moscow is trying to keep "them" (the other CIS capitals) informed, but the reverse is not happening.

Addressing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee shortly before his trip, Baker said: "The collapse of the Soviet Union has given us a once-a-century opportunity to promote U.S. interests and values worldwide." As you can see, he referred to U.S. interests rather than common human interests and values—which we love to talk about. The two are not completely identical, and the emphasis on the former is, of course, no accident.

Arriving in Moscow 17 February after yet another Commonwealth summit has ended in Minsk, Baker will be trying to get the fresh information he requires and will, in turn, give his impressions and views. The greatest attention is being attracted by the Central Asian part of his tour, which was correspondingly considered to be the main part of the trip—the other stages were added at the last minute so as not to "offend" anyone. In the current situation, above all regarding nuclear matters, the interests of the United States and Russia in Central Asia largely coincide—although, of course, from all standpoints this geopolitical area is more Russian than American.

THE LOS ANGELES TIMES has described U.S. diplomacy's role as being to cover any possible spread of influence by belligerent and fundamentalist Iran and to channel the emergent statehood in Tashkent, Ashkhabad, and Dushanbe—with their inevitable Islamic bent—toward Western democracy, as well as toward moderate Turkey and Egypt. Nothing in this idea is incompatible with Russian interests, although only an insignificant part of Russian interests will be covered by this task. Differences could emerge, God forbid, at the point where U.S. encroachment on Russia's legitimate influence in Central Asia begins, along with any attempts to come between the two.

Given the nature of the Tehran regime, its desire to acquire nuclear weapons could sharply intensify instability in the large Asian region and worldwide. In order to prevent weapons and nuclear specialists leaving the former Soviet Union via the Central Asian republics, Washington is prepared to set up ties with Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Turkmenistan, abandoning its initial doubts about the democratic nature of the regimes there. This new emphasis is in addition to the strategically understandable attention which the Americans have devoted to Kazakhstan from the outset. Baker will be spending more time in Tashkent and Uzbekistan than in

Moscow—although, admittedly, the only full day out of the three he will spend there will be Sunday, 16 February.

According to the itinerary, 25 hours and 20 minutes will be spent in Moscow 17 and 18 February. The primarily nuclear subject matter of the Moscow meetings was determined by Bush and Yeltsin at Camp David. The Moscow meetings will again be returning to the two presidents' initiatives on further sharp strategic arms cuts. One could say that the difference between the two positions is 2,000 warheads—should they be reduced to 2,500 in the years to come (as Yeltsin has proposed) or to the 4,500 proposed by Bush? And how can the imbalance affecting Russia—obvious from the nature of the cuts proposed by the Americans—be eradicated? That is, of course, if Russia, in the wake of the defunct USSR, insists on even a semblance of parity.

Moscow is also expecting specific proposals from the Baker delegation about where the $400 million allocated by Washington for the expedited elimination of tactical nuclear weapons on the territory of the former USSR may end up. And, finally, the question of the fate of our scientists and nuclear specialists is particularly acute and urgent. The pride of yesterday's superpower, they are now in the position of orphans or stepchildren. The fatherland has no money to look after them, yet it is frightened and fearful of letting them try "seasonal work."

"Urals! The stronghold of our power, its breadwinner and blacksmith," Aleksandr Tvardovskiy once wrote. Between his visits to Dushanbe and Tashkent Baker will visit the super secret Chelyabinsk-70, where the military atom has reigned for decades. Viktor Mikhaylov, Russian deputy minister of nuclear power generation and one of our main military nuclear specialists, said that the secretary will see a "beautiful city—albeit with empty shelves in the stores. Although that will hardly surprise him."

According to Mikhaylov, a total of 100,000 people are employed in the nuclear military-industrial complex. Some 10-15,000 are cleared for secret work and, of these, 2-3,000 have access to information of paramount importance in the sphere of sensitive technologies. It is their future that Western leaders are currently worried about. Citing Mikhaylov's figures, the diplomatic correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES quoted a Bush administration spokesman: "Washington's short-term aim is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear equipment and technology. But its long-term aim is to promote the conversion of military enterprises."

In conversation with me Viktor Mikhaylov did not object to these aims in principle, but firmly drew the following line: "If they want to destroy our nuclear complex, that's pie in the sky." Not all our interests coincide, and it is hardly surprising if not all of the suspicions which have built up over decades have been dispelled.

"Yes, salaries are modest. People do not earn very much, but there is no unemployment, and thousands of specialists are not being made redundant," Mikhaylov stated. And again he emphasized with pride: "We have never gone cap in hand, nor will we." But we are prepared to cooperate "on nonmilitary subjects." A delegation from Arzamas-16—another super secret city, where the military atom was once developed by Andrey Sakharov—is currently in the United States, visiting its "fellow" U.S. laboratories of Los Alamos and Livermore and discussing cooperation issues. Viktor Mikhaylov sees mutual interests in the speediest destruction of nuclear weapons and in the construction of special dumps to store the plutonium extracted from nuclear warheads.

A source at the Russian Foreign Ministry involved with the subject matter of the talks with Baker in Moscow reports that the question of setting up an international center to provide help to CIS nuclear scientists will be discussed. The idea came from Kohl and Mitterrand, who are worried about the dangers of a "brain drain." There was also the letter from our scientists to Yeltsin and Bush about collaboration in saving basic science. It is now being planned to "marry up" these two initiatives. It is planned that Andrey Kozyrev and James Baker will publicly support the idea of an international center in a special statement. German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher will later invite "G-7" representatives to flesh out the plan.

...So that is the U.S. week in the CIS. The airspace of the still fragile Commonwealth will be crisscrossed by the Washington governmental airliner and U.S. military transport aircraft carrying humanitarian aid. The aid has been organized effectively, but is small scale—particularly in comparison with aid from West Europe. But it was enough to provide a propaganda overture to the Baker visit. Given the lack of any foreign policy coordination within the CIS, the U.S. secretary of state is now acting as a coordinator—as far as he is able and, needless to say, above all for his own country's interests.

Debate on CIS Stabilization Fund noted

PM2002100392 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 7

[Report by Artur Blinov: "Stabilization Fund for the Community. The United States Changes Its Stance"]

[Text] During his visit to the United States Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin asked Western countries to provide financial support for the economic reform in Russia and the other CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] republics. The question was discussed during the meeting between B. Yeltsin and U.S. President G. Bush at Camp David. A number of Western countries, above all Britain and Germany, had previously voiced support for the establishment of such a fund, with the United States opposed to it. Now there has been a change in the U.S. position.

The stabilization fund could prop up the currency, by guaranteeing a stable exchange rate. Unlike direct financial assistance, resources from the stabilization fund are not transferred to the actual country that is being assisted. They are only used if the monetary unit that is being "stabilized" is being subjected to "attack"—attempts by those who possess large sums to shed them in favor of foreign currency. Given a realistically established exchange rate and correct financial policy on the part of the state receiving the support, the stabilization fund may not incur any expenditure. Nonetheless, the creation of the fund is an effective means of strengthening confidence in the monetary unit of the country that is carrying out the reform, particularly in the domestic economic sphere.

In January 1990 the Western countries set up a stabilization fund for Poland of $1 billion. The fund has not spent a single dollar so far, THE NEW YORK TIMES notes, so effective was the stabilizing effect of the actual reform.

In the case of Russia and the other CIS republics, the stabilization fund should be larger, experts believe. The view is that it could be between $5 and 12 billion.

THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that the countries of the "seven" have not yet agreed either on the size of the stabilization fund for the CIS or when it should be set up. Britain believes, for example, that it should be formed as soon as possible. The United States says that it is too early to establish the stabilization fund in conditions where the ruble is extremely unstable. According to U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, Russia and the other republics must first join the IMF and elaborate with it measures to strengthen "economic discipline," and only then will the time be right for creating the stabilization fund.

In any event, THE NEW YORK TIMES reports, the United States, France, and Germany do not think it is possible to create the fund before the April session of the IMF board of governors, when it is expected Russia will become a member of the organization.

Implications of Western Aid Highlighted

PM1802121192 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Feb 92 p 2

[Article by observer Aleksandr Golts: "By What Path and On What Terms Are We Joining World Community?"]

[Text] Without overcoming the consequences of the closure of the country and society, without developing full contacts with the world community, Russia will be unable to become a modern civilized state. This was stressed by Russian President B. Yeltsin in his speech in the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet on the results of his foreign tour. He highlighted two main foreign policy aims of the present moment. They are the consolidation of Russia's entry into the world community and international support for its economic reforms. At the same time, B. Yeltsin stressed, we are not indifferent to the path by which and the terms on which we return to the world community. For all the diversity of events taking place in Russia and in other regions of the former USSR, I think it was this question—who we are and how the world community treats us—which determined last week's trend.

One could not help asking that question at the very start of the week, when the "air bridge" was opened to deliver emergency food and medical aid to the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]. It would seem that this was obvious evidence that the civilized world has taken us into its embrace. But from the first day of operation "Hope" it became obvious that each of its participants, in addition to general aims, was also pursuing its own aims. "This may not sound very pleasant," the United States' CBS television company notes in this connection, "but the operation which has been begun is being implemented not only for the sake of philanthropy but also for the sake of publicity. The Europeans, who are supplying the CIS with the lion's share of all its foreign aid, were really shaken when they saw the Americans trying to present matters as though the United States was the leader in rendering aid."

But on the other hand what do these disputes matter to us? After all, food and medical supplies seem to be being delivered to us as a gift. There is no talk of any price or any conditions. But there is nonetheless a price to this aid, and quite a large one. B. Yeltsin made it clear to the West, THE TIMES writes, what Russia needs today: approximately $5 billion to create a stabilization fund to support the ruble and almost the same amount again to buy food and medical supplies. This aid should be delivered within the next six weeks. So operation "Hope" in my view is in fact in a certain sense preventing this aid from being delivered. The West's obvious desire has appeared here to contrast long-term economic cooperation with Russia and one-off actions directly linked to support for reforms.

After all, whichever way you turn, the Western governments' potential on the economic and financial plane is somewhat restricted. Only in a totalitarian society can rulers disregard the expense in an attempt to achieve a particular economic goal. As for our partners in the Western governments, in actual fact they cannot organize more than one-off actions like operation "Hope."

On the plane of long-term cooperation they can insure only the prerequisites for financial and economic collaboration: insurance funds, tax and other benefits for corporations which venture to do business with the CIS. But the final decision as to whether to run the risk or not remains with the private companies. And the fact that we have become recipients of emergency humanitarian aid in no way makes us attractive partners in the eyes of potential investors.

In just the same way, in my view, arguments about the danger of a conservative restoration in our country have

a far from stimulating effect on Western capital. Of course, the West does not want a new "cold war." But in no circumstances will businessmen risk their own money and invest it in the economy of a country where the possibility of a coup is allowed by its leaders.

The question of the terms and paths for entering the world community was also constantly present in one form or another during U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's trip to Moldova, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. This time the head of the U.S. foreign policy department, evidently thoroughly accustomed to the role of the center's fully empowered representative with regard to the CIS republics, decided to visit unstable regions on the territory of the former USSR. And not only the present unstable regions but also those which, as the Americans see it, could arise in the future. And if the talks in Chisinau, Baku, and Yerevan were conducted around the safeguarding of human rights and the need for a peaceful solution of all vexed issues, in dealing with the leaders of the Central Asian republics, other conditions were revealed. The main one is these states' great orientation toward cooperation with the West (here too the United States is prepared to render the necessary technological and consultative aid). Washington is obviously worried at the prospect of influence from Islamic fundamentalism on these big republics.

As for disarmament problems in whose solution we recently saw the main way of gaining international prestige, it is no accident that J. Baker left them for discussion in Moscow for the beginning of next week. Washington would like to conduct these talks in an atmosphere of certainty with regard to the fate of the former Soviet Union's Armed Forces determined by the heads of the CIS states in Minsk. Actually, I think that as I write these lines neither Washington nor I has any certainty that all these problems will be resolved this time. Most likely the sides will limit themselves to routine interim decisions.

And that in turn will influence the position of the United States and of other Western countries and the entire world community.

Scale of U.S. Aid Airlift to CIS Reported

PM1402162792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by Sergey Taranov: "United States-CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Airlift in Operation"]

[Text] The first 12 U.S. Air Force heavy transport aircraft arrived in cities of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] republics 10 February with cargoes of humanitarian aid on board.

In its previous issue IZVESTIYA reported that Moscow, St. Petersburg, and the capitals of the CIS republics, except Georgia, would be the immediate recipients of U.S. aid (it comprises food which had been intended for the U.S. Army during the war in the Persian Gulf, medicines, and medical equipment).

According to information obtained from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, the aircraft bringing the humanitarian aid to the Commonwealth states will arrive in accordance with the following schedule: 10 February—Alma-Ata, Ashkhabad, Dushanbe, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Yerevan, Bishkek, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Tashkent, Kishinev; 11 February—Moscow; 12 February—Bishkek, Ashkhabad, Baku, Kharkov, St. Petersburg, Yerevan; 15 February—Ulan-Ude, Chelyabinsk; 17 February—Lvov, Novokuznetsk, Perm; 18 February—Semipalatinsk.

"Throughout the territory of the CIS traffic control services are ready to receive the guests," the civil aviation central flight control service reported. "The Boeing, Douglas, and Hercules freighters will be given the go-ahead on their prearranged routes. In no way will they disrupt scheduled air traffic. All local traffic controllers have experience of conducting conversations in English."

Nonetheless, much depends on the weather, the political situation, and the sides' willingness to dispatch and receive the cargoes on a specific day. IZVESTIYA correspondent Viktor Surkov reported from Tajikistan that U.S. pilots made a trial run before landing the first food-laden Lockheed in Dushanbe.

But even places that are guaranteed to receive U.S. aid should not expect any marked improvement in the food or medicine situation, since the deliveries are very, very small. In the two weeks 10 through 24 February the plan is for the transport aircraft to make 54 flights. If each carries on average 80-100 tonnes of freight, the assistance from the United States will total around 5,000-5,500 tonnes. For comparison's sake we will cite data on the free food deliveries by the EEC from December 1991 through March 1992, worth 450 million ECU's: meat—114,000 tonnes, dried milk—77,000, baby food—10,000; butter—22,000; vegetable oil—10,000, pasta—2,500, and 3,000 tonnes of tomato concentrate.

But the U.S. airlift in February—as one of the leaders of the humanitarian aid commission under the Russian Government observed—can only be seen as a rehearsal, a prelude to bigger actions. Or as a kind of test of our honesty and ability to distribute foreign aid to those who really need it. According to preliminary data, the United States is prepared to follow up the army food with products and medicines worth $165 million and, perhaps, more.

Meanwhile, Japan is joining the movement to give emergency aid to the CIS. The Japanese Government has earmarked more than 6.5 billion yen ($45 million) for the purpose. On 10 February the JAL airline delivered the first 12 tonnes of humanitarian freight to Khabarovsk.

Among the items of news connected with the reception and distribution of foreign aid it is worth noting that the Russian leaders are considering making tougher demands on officials who ignore the requests of the organizations distributing the aid.

The church is getting involved, too. IMA-PRESS reports that the Georgian Patriarchate has condemned the sale in commercial stores of imported canned meat received by the local church as humanitarian aid from the Moscow Patriarchate.

Kuwaiti Plans for Aiding CIS States Outlined

PM2002113792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by Gennadiy Charodeyev: "Kuwait Will Help The CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States], Despite Its Own Problems"]

[Text] Kuwaiti Finance Minister Nasir 'Abdallah al-Ridan, who is on a working visit to our country, left for Ukraine early in the morning on 17 February.

At the Kuwaiti Embassy in Moscow and also at the Russian Foreign Ministry your IZVESTIYA correspondent was told that the delegation includes representatives of the Kuwait Development Fund and important businessmen and politicians from that Arab country. The purpose of their visit is to give financial and humanitarian aid to the Commonwealth states. The Kuwaiti Government delegation intends to visit 14 former Soviet republics (except for Georgia), including Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

In connection with the complex political and economic situation in a number of CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] states, the Kuwaitis will make one-day trips to the sovereign states, subsequently returning to Moscow, apparently. According to a delegation member, the minister and the accompanying officials will visit Belarus on 18 February, after Ukraine, and will then go to Moldova and the Baltic states. Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Russian foreign economic experts believe that at the talks in the CIS countries the Kuwaiti minister will in all likelihood discuss prospects for investments and for credits from the development fund and of an agreement on their mutual protection. It must be borne in mind that despite their own internal problems, as a result of the Iraqi aggression, Kuwait gave the former USSR credit of $1 billion around one year ago.

During the delegation's stay in Moscow Finance Minister Nasir al-Ridan had meetings with Ye. Gaydar, Russian vice premier, P. Aven, chairman of the Foreign Economic Relations Committee, and E. Shevardnadze, president of the Foreign Policy Association. It is known that the talks touched on questions of the expansion of trade between Russia and Kuwait, the granting of credits, and the possibility of direct Kuwaiti investments in the Russian Federation economy. The question of recruiting Russian specialists for work in Kuwait was examined. There are suggestions that, in particular, oil production workers from East Siberia could go to Kuwait.

'Battle' for Central Asian Republics Continues

PM1902165792 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 92 p 3

[Report by A. Shumilin: "Plenty With A Green Seal"]

[Text] Cairo—The battle for the once Soviet but now Islamic republics is hotting up, it would appear, moving increasingly into the sphere of economics and the provision of food aid. In the next few days the recently created mechanism for providing humanitarian aid to the Central Asian states of the Commonwealth will begin operating, and can be summed up in the simple formula: Egyptian goods—Gulf monarchies' money (Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates have allocated $100 million to these purposes!) In the course of two months 54 flights will be made from Cairo to the capitals of the aforementioned states of the Commonwealth.

Meanwhile Tehran has hosted a summit meeting of the member countries of the Economic Cooperation Organization [ECO], consisting of Turkey, Iran, and Pakistan. The leaders of the Central Asian states also took part as observers. The main question on the agenda—the prospects for the creation of an "Islamic Common Market."

The leaders of the what were recently the Central Asian republics, while banking on the "Islamic card," seem to be expressing increasing reluctance recently to join in Tehran's "high risk" games. There are increasing signs that they realize that the ideas of Islamic fundamentalism preached by the Iranian leadership—if they were to take root in Central Asia—would hit above all the reformist forces in their states and would eventually turn the region into a source of global danger.

Black Sea Officer Seeks Asylum in Turkey

LD1902174292 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Feb (ITAR-TASS)—As an ITAR-TASS correspondent was told at the Navy press service, on 15 February, when going through the Bosporus, Captain Third Class Boris Kholomiyev jumped overboard from the patrol boat Bezukoriznennyy and was picked up by a Turkish launch. In response to an inquiry from the the Russian Federation Embassy, the Turkish Foreign Ministry said that the officer has asked for political asylum and is in Turkey.

The officer is married and has two children. His wife works as a lecturer at a military college in Sevastopol. The Navy press service does not have information on motives for Kholomiyev's act.

Arms Trading Claims in Czechoslovakia Denied

PM1902143992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 4

[Report from the CIS Armed Forces press center by Colonel Vladimir Nikanorov: "We Do Not Have Forces in Czechoslovakia and They Are Not Trading in Arms"]

[Text] REUTER, citing the Czechoslovak paper MLADA FRONTA DNES, reported that officers of the Central Group of Forces, which was stationed on the territory of Czechoslovakia, are allegedly selling weapons illegally on the local black market. I asked Gennadiy Propashchev, head of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Armed Forces High Command's mission for the Sale of the Real Estate of the Former Central Group of Forces in Prague, to comment on this claim.

"The information is not true," he said. "Neither we nor the Czechoslovak law enforcement bodies has recorded a single instance of the sale by Soviet servicemen of pistols, assault rifles, or ammunition, not to mention tanks and helicopters, either when the Soviet forces were leaving the country or now.

"At the same time, I must say that at the final stage of the Central Group of Forces' stay on Czechoslovak soil we ecountered efforts by some Czechoslovak citizens to illegally acquire weapons from our servicemen. We put a stop to all these efforts (more than 10 cases were recorded) and the gun seekers were handed over to the Czechoslovak authorities. Although I know nothing about the measures taken against them.

"The question has another aspect to it. There is a wave of thefts in Czechoslovakia at the moment of weapons belonging to the Czechoslovak Army. This information comes from reports by the republic's internal affairs organs. It is worrying the country's defense ministry and General Staff at the moment. Perhaps the item in the Czechoslovak paper referred to by Reuter was intended to distract public attention from this problem. As for our weapons and combat equipment, there have not been any on Czechoslovak territory for ages.

"On leaving the country last summer, units and subunits of the Central Group of Forces took everything with them. Moreover, no weapons were lost during the withdrawal. We kept a strict record of every item. We do not have any troops left in Czechoslovakia either. So the claims that officers of the former Central Group of Forces are trading on the Czech black market are totally groundless," G. Propashchev said in conclusion.

Commonwealth

Shaposhnikov Address on Nagorno-Karabakh Issue

LD1902170192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1613 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow, 19 February (ITAR-TASS)—Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] Joint Armed Forces, has addressed the Council of CIS Heads of States in connection with the events in Nagorno-Karabakh. The address said:

The events around Nagorno-Karabakh are taking on an ever more tense and menacing character. The scale of combat operations is widening. The number of casualties is rising. Towns and villages are being destroyed. There are continued attempts to draw servicemen into the conflict, and continuing encroachments on the arms, military hardware, and stocks of material resources belonging to the Transcaucasian Military District.

All these actions run completely counter to the statement of the CIS heads of state of 14 February 1992 on the impermissibility of using or threatening to use force and on the need to resolve contentious problems by exclusively peaceful means, through negotiations.

The situation is being made worse by the persistent attempts of the leadership of the Azerbaijani Republic to set up its own armed forces on the basis of the 4th Army of the Transcaucasian Military District which, in turn, prompts the Armenian side to create its own army on the basis of the 7th Army of the Transcaucasian Military District.

The implementation of these intentions will result in drawing regular units and formations of the Transcaucasian Military District into combat operations and will inevitably turn the conflict in a large-scale fratricidal war.

The development of events in the Transcaucasus is causing serious concern among states bordering the Azerbaijani Republic and the Republic of Armenia.

The Command of the CIS Joint Armed Forces deems it necessary to undertake urgent measures in order to prevent Transcaucasian Military District troops from being drawn into combat operations and to prevent the conflict around Nagorno-Karabakh from escalating. For these purposes it is essential to solve the following priority issues:

1. To employ the entire political authority and capabilities of leaders of independent states to solve the conflict around Nagorno- Karabakh by political means.
2. Until a political solution to the problem is found, the Transcaucasian states should refrain from creating their own armed forces.
3. To examine the issue of forming a contingent of interstate armed forces of the CIS, which will be subordinate to the Council of CIS Heads of States, for the purpose of maintaining order, stabilizing the situation, and insuring a solution to interethnic and internal political issues by political means.

General Ivashov on Results of Minsk Summit

LD2002110192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0920 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Andrey Naryshkin]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Feb (ITAR-TASS)—The main result of the recent meeting of the CIS leaders is that they confirmed the intention to set up joint armed forces as part of the strategic forces, general purpose forces, and the national armed forces subordinated operationally to the main command. This is the view of Lieutenant General Leonid Ivashov, chief of the administration of affairs of the joint CIS Armed Forces.

In a conversation with ITAR-TASS, Gen. Ivashov noted that, as far as the most important documents prepared for the Minsk meeting are concerned, it has not been possible to adopt an agreement on the powers of the highest Commonwealth bodies in the area of defense questions and on the main command, on the principles of the armed forces manpower acquisition, and of military service. Nor has the work been finished on an agreement among Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan on the transfer of nuclear weapons. The presidents were unable to examine the drafts of some other agreements (on law protection bodies, provision of intelligence-gathering, and universal military regulations) due to the lack of time. Evidently they will be submitted for examination at the next meeting of the CIS leaders in Kiev on 20 March.

There also exists an item, as part of the protocol, concerning the speeding up of the working out of the draft agreements, connected with the fulfillment of the strategic offensive arms treaties and the treaties on the conventional armed forces in Europe, the general said. In Minsk, the sides failed to arrive at a common view on certain items, among them the matter of the level of the conventional armed forces that remain in the independent states after the planned cuts have been put into effect. One is yet to come to an agreement on who will have how many tanks, planes, armored vehicles, and artillery.

According to Leonid Ivashov, a separate package of documents establishing the principles of the operational subordination of troops, the procedure for the provision of material and technical supplies, the carrying out of one's military service, and the system of combat training is yet to be worked out for the eight states that have agreed to have joint general purpose forces. The question of the joint military budget will be submitted for examination by the presidents on 20 March only if it has been found possible to resolve it at the level of heads of governments, the general stated.

Baltics

'Calm Waiting Period' Advocated in Relations

LD0902174192 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1500 GMT 7 Feb 92

[Text] Relations with Taiwan must not spoil our relations with the PRC, [Estonian] Deputy Foreign Minister Enn Liimets said in an interview to the Baltic News Service. Should we establish official diplomatic relations with Taiwan, big complications could arise in relations with China, Enn Liimets opined. At the same time he is convinced that China may also become one of the biggest trade partners for Estonia in the future. It would also be very inopportune to have a permanent opponent by way of a permanent member of the UN Security Council, the deputy foreign minister added.

The relations of the Baltic countries with Taiwan and China were discussed at a meeting of deputy foreign ministers which took place in Riga. As is known, so far Latvia is the only Baltic state to have established consular relations with Taiwan. As a protest against this the presentation of credentials from a Chinese ambassador in Latvia did not take place. At the Riga meeting the opinion was reached that a calm waiting period should ensue in order to see what effect the Latvian active policy toward Taiwan will have.

Military

Future of Former Soviet Navy Discussed, Viewed

Main Staff Favors Unity

PM1402163592 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 12 Feb 92 First Edition p 1

[Report by Vitaliy Potapov: "'Russia—A Great Naval Power'"]

[Text] Precisely because the roundtable in the Navy Main Staff was given this title, it primarily discussed the Russian Navy's remarkable history and traditions. On the threshold of its 300th anniversary this conversation was, of course, more than appropriate.

Alas, the recent events which have taken the Black Sea Fleet to the brink of virtual destruction could not fail to be reflected in the professional dialogue, in which historians and today's practised sailors, former Fleet commanders, and today's Main Staff officers, writers, commentators... took part.

It is senseless to divide our own country's property, to auction off what was created and augmented by the labor and feats of arms of millions—this is irresponsible not only in the sense of military-strategic and politico-economic priorities. It is irresponsible to history—past and future.

A navy must be united. And if a joint navy, it must be under unified command. This was agreed at the roundtable by those assembled at the Main Staff, by those for whom the Navy is not just service or a profession but a destiny, with which people should not play evil games.

Legalities, Impediments Assessed

LD1802040492 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Italicized passages recorded in Russian with superimposed translation into English]

[Text] [Announcer] Now, how two retired admirals and a top official at naval headquarters see the future of what was the Soviet Navy.

First, retired Admiral Georgiy Yegorov.

[Yegorov] *Much is being said today to the effect that Russia and the United States are not adversaries, that we are not targeting missiles on each other. But America has not yet said it intends to retarget its missiles. We are in favor of a reduction in nuclear missiles, those in the Navy as well, but not at the expense of security. The Navy has a difficult task. The Commonwealth of Independent States has 42,000 kilometers of coast line and these have to be protected. Every one of the 12 Trident submarines in the United States Navy is capable of destroying 150 cities. [Word indistinct] and the United States has 14 aircraft carriers, each one with 90 aircraft, half of which have nuclear weapons on board. All these patrol the waters around the Soviet Union.*

[Announcer] That was retired Admiral Georgiy Yegorov. And now the retired Admiral Vadim Korobov insists that only a unified navy can protect the countries of the Commonwealth.

[Korobov] *The Navy brings together the last technical advances in a great many fields of learning. A navy can't be built overnight and it cannot be split up by, say, assigning none but nuclear-capable submarines to the strategic forces and everything else to the conventional. In such an advance, not a single strategic submarine could leave base. It would lack protection of vessels and antisubmarine aircraft. It could not patrol either, having no multipurpose subs to cover it.*

[Announcer] That was retired Admiral Vadim Korobov. Captain First Rank Valeriy Moyseyenko, who is chief of the department of international naval law at naval headquarters, points out that the former Soviet Navy cannot automatically become the navy of the Commonwealth.

[Moyseyenko] *Under international naval law a naval vessel must belong to the armed forces of a specific country, not to a commonwealth of countries, and it must have the insignia that distinguish the vessels of that country—that is their national flag and other insignia.*

Also, its crew must be headed by an officer in the service of a specific country. And finally there must be military discipline on board ship.

[Announcer] That was Captain First Rank Valeriy Moyseyenko, chief of the Department of International Naval Law at naval headquarters.

Last month the heads of the member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States decided that the Navy of the former Soviet Union would belong to Russia as part of the strategic forces of the Commonwealth. Its vessels will fly the historical Russian naval flag known as the Andreyev flag. Three fleets, the Northern, Pacific, and Baltic, pose no difficulties. The first two are stationed in Russian waters and the third Russia has taken under its jurisdiction. As for giving part of the Black Sea Fleet to Ukraine and part of the Caspian to Azerbaijan, this will be negotiated. At present, Russia is the only country financing the former Soviet Navy.

Army Uncertainties Jeopardize CIS Security

PM1802095492 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by Nikolay Andreyev under the rubric "Today and Tomorrow": "Will the Russians Want War, If They Have Their Own Army?"]

[Text] Now is probably the best time for a perfidious and calculating enemy to attack us—each CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] member individually and all of us together. Over the vast expanses of the former Union there are mutual threats and disorder, and passion and arrogance run riot. The Army is afflicted by the same diseases as the whole of the former Soviet Union, it cannot tell whom it belongs to and against whom it is preparing to make war. If the improbable happens and an aggressor attacks us, there is no certainty that the Army will be able to deal with him.

Fortunately, military aggression against the Commonwealth is indeed improbable. We have a unique opportunity, without fearing a blow from outside, to tackle our own affairs and problems. And first and foremost our military affairs. They are in a disastrous state. At the end of last week we were impatiently awaiting reports from Minsk: What will the statesmen decide? And above all, what kind of army will there be—unified, separate, or joint.

The Army is an organism that exists on the principle of single command. The military can fulfill their duties provided certain conditions are observed. Chief among these is that they must know definitely whom they are subordinate to and whose commands to obey. And if, say, Ukraine becomes an independent state and does not want to form part of the Commonwealth military structure, whose orders should servicemen on its territory obey? There is no answer to that question. The Ukrainian leaders naturally think that the three military districts of the former Soviet Army and the Black Sea Fleet have automatically become the republic's. They should therefore be subordinate to the republic defense ministry. Neither Yeltsin nor Marshal Shaposhnikov agrees with that. So it is not surprising if a bomber regiment takes off from its station in Ukraine and lands, complete with regimental banner, in Russia.

A very dangerous precedent. All this leads to a situation in which the Army is tempted to become a political force in its own right. We have seen what this means in reality, in all its brutality, in Yugoslavia. In our case there is also the danger that one of the world's biggest armies is basically living outside the law. Formerly it operated under Union normative acts—laws, decrees, and instructions, of which there were about 1,500. Now the CIS members reject Union laws. And consequently they leave the military in the position of people without rights. Which generates in them dissatisfaction, anger, and the desire to take power into their own hands.

Nor can the Army exist without military doctrine. Military doctrine offers a system of measures to ensure the state's security and incorporates all possible scenarios for unleashing and waging war and an assessment of the sources of military danger. It used to be simple: The confrontation of two powers defined how and against whom we should prepare for war. Today the features of the external enemy have faded and grown dim, and his image has begun to acquire purely friendly outlines. And in general the impression is that the Commonwealth member states have friends and allies just about everywhere—in Europe, Asia, America—except among the "free republics" which, only recently, were welded together eternally by great Rus [Russia]. Each state of the former Union has only one concern: how to emphasize as heavily as possible its independence in everything, and above all in foreign policy. In these circumstances it is all the more futile to talk about a common Commonwealth military doctrine. And likewise a unified army.

The situation is further complicated when you start analyzing the role and purpose of the strategic deterrent forces. These are precisely the forces that cannot operate without a single military doctrine. But the differences between Ukraine and Russia, on whose territory these forces are based, are too great to expect them to come together in a single understanding of whom specifically they are supposed to deter. Yeltsin's sensational statement that the missiles will no longer be targeted on American cities prompted a great many questions.

It is also frightening that B. Yeltsin made his statement without consulting with L. Kravchuk, N. Nazarbayev, or S. Shushkevich. As we know, there is supposed to be a coordinated decision by the four presidents on any question relating to the strategic deterrent forces. For instance, in the context of a retaliatory strike. But will the president of a republic that has not come under attack consent to that? Hardly. That would mean that he would be entering a war for the sake of another state's interests. Let me stress again that an attack on us, and especially a nuclear attack, is highly unlikely. But all the

same, the question remains: How many fingers are there on the nuclear button? This problem faced NATO too at one time. Some allies demanded dual control of American nuclear weapons in Europe. The military were against it, because the U.S. President would have to waste hours discussing with the allies whether or not to use nuclear weapons. And in war, time is everything. In a crisis, single command of strategic forces is a vital necessity.

The uncertainty over the CIS' military problems arises largely because Russia does not have its own army. The Army cannot become a joint army unless it has first been divided. The Armed Forces are still regarded as Russia's. Uzbek President Islam Karimov stated in Minsk: "All those who advocate unified command are at the same time conducting talks with Russia so that it will pay for the maintenance of the Armed Forces located on the territory of those states." Yeltsin, however, stressed that Russia does not intend to create its own army. At the same time, according to unofficial reports, a Russian presidential decree on the creation of a Russian army is already in readiness. Recently the General Staff, at the Russian parliament's request, sent a group of experts on a mission to the White House to work on a draft Russian army military doctrine, a security concept, and draft laws. So most likely we will soon be hearing about the creation of a Russian army. But against whom will it be preparing to wage war?

Transition Needed Before Red Army Dissolution

PM1802144992 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 92 p 1

[Report by A. Krayniy: "Red Army: From Narva to Minsk"]

[Text] A call from Odessa: "Why do you hate Ukraine so much?" A letter from Poltava Oblast: "If you were to hold a referendum in Ukraine about Krayniy's fate, I would not vouch for his life..."

Love and hatred are emotions, and we are talking about the Army in similar terms. Let us conduct the discussion at state level now that we are all living in independent states. When President Dudayev seems not to notice that troops in Chechnya are basically under siege and increasingly brazen attacks are being carried out on military installations—virtually in broad daylight by organized formations; when President Kravchuk demands that President Yeltsin withdraw Admiral Kasatonov from Sevastopol because he dislikes him; when President Yeltsin, speaking at the All-Army Officers' Assembly, promises every officer between $1,000 and $3,000 in resettlement allowances, then you get the feeling that you have been swindled somehow. You were promised that you would be living in a sovereign independent state that adheres to all kinds of international agreements, a state that any day now will become prosperous in a democratic and civilized manner, but instead you end up in the USSR time and time again.

Well, now the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] has been established and all the presidents have agreed to it, might it be possible to agree to a civilized divorce, at least for the time being on a temporary basis, before the centrifugal trends gather momentum? Do the independent states want to have their own armies? They are entitled to have armies, but the Armed Forces are not a pie that can be carved up and eaten at one go without choking. There has to be some kind of transition period during which all jointly acquired military property can be divided up calmly without mutual recriminations and social guarantees can be established both for those remaining in the ranks and (more importantly) for those affected by the cutbacks. Cutbacks in the Army, incidentally, are inevitable, however much the very idea of this may be anathema to military personnel. Of course, it is not the officers' fault that, having given 18 years of their lives to the state and now suffering hardships and privations, they now find that politicians screw up their faces at the mere thought of them: Not that lot with their problems again! But the bottom line is that the Union no longer exists, the facts have to be taken into account, and in this case neither a strike nor any other more decisive form of activity will change the situation. There is not and cannot be a single state institution for a power that does not exist. This is as indisputable as the law of universal gravitation. And if this is the case, all the indications are that sooner or later all CIS participant countries will acquire their own armies. It is only possible if Russia, Kazakhstan, and a number of the other Central Asian republics take up a constructive stance and preserve unified—not joint—Armed Forces. At any rate, Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Armed Forces, toured a number of Central Asian republics just before the All-Army Officers' Assembly and returned in a good mood—according to him, he had managed to find mutual understanding on the issues that were discussed.

But in this case the initiative put forward by Boris Yeltsin, who announced Army cutbacks totaling 700,000 men, stems not so much from a desire to find easy answers to complex questions as from economic realities. Incidentally, this also has to do with the issue of why the Army reforms are on the skids. I am afraid that people who attribute the absence of any visible changes in the army to the machinations of the CIS Armed Forces Main Command, the machinations of conservative generals, and the unwillingness of the Main Command itself to surrender one iota of its power are reducing the entire visible spectrum of problems to a binary system of coordinates: good/bad and black/white. I am afraid that the nub of the issue has nothing to do with machinations, although these undoubtedly do exist. There is no money, and in the foreseeable future none is likely to appear. For this reason a radical cutback is the only option—albeit a pretty poor one—among all the reform elements. And we should not deceive ourselves that only soldiers and those who have earned their pensions will be cut back—this is easy to do on paper...

However, unless this army which is hanging over Russia is reduced, it will break the back not just of the reforms, but of Russia itself (and Ukraine for that matter, or whoever you like).

Right now some military personnel are attempting to actively interfere in the political decisionmaking process—having elected officers and generals as people's deputies, we are now reaping the fruits. On this basis some people are starting to exploit the possible transformation of the Army into an autonomous political force as a scare tactic. However, on hearing this, officers themselves occasionally start to believe that the Army can grasp and decide its own future. At the same time both these groups are talking about the Yugoslav option. This must be shunned! The Yugoslav People's Army started off as the obedient tool of Belgrade in its attempts to halt Croatia and Slovenia. In our country even this is impossible. In our country something else might happen, as when a Russian from the Ukrainian Army (just as an example!) comes together on the battlefield with a Ukrainian from the Russian army. Nobody will succeed in establishing a truly national army. Which means that over and over again the Army will be not an autonomous political force but a tool in the hands of the politicians. The army had a go once before—they came out into Senate Square [in 1825 Decembrist attempt to seize power].

And what happened then? [autocratic rule]

Model for CIS States' Security Propounded

PM1402102592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Feb 92 p 3

[Article by Colonel General S. Bogdanov and Colonel N. Galusha: "Concept of National Security Is Vitally Important: This Is the Opinion of Specialists From Commonwealth of Independent States Armed Forces General Staff Center for Operational Strategic Studies"]

[Text] The disappearance of the USSR from the political map of the world, and the acquisition of sovereignty by the republics which made up the Union have spawned a number of military-political problems, both global and regional, among others in the sphere of the international and national security of the newly formed independent states and their Commonwealth.

Proclaiming the building of democratic rule-of-law societies as their aim, the Commonwealth participants have also assumed certain obligations in strengthening international strategic stability and national security. However the sovereignization process has exacerbated formerly hidden contradictions between the former republics of the USSR; their relations have gone beyond the framework of the accords reached in Alma-Ata and Minsk and are fraught with the emergence of various serious problems within the Commonwealth itself. Different approaches of the members of the Commonwealth to ensuring their own security and the security of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] as a whole have also emerged.

While Russia has put forward large scale initiatives in the sphere of arms reduction and limitation, confidence-building measures, and arms control, certain other CIS states are privatizing troops on their territories, expediting the establishment of their own national armies on this basis, and seeking to "privatize" the Armed Forces weapons, hardware, and property.

It is perfectly obvious that this path leads to a sharp escalation of already incipient confrontation. How can this destructive process be avoided?

In these circumstances, in our opinion, the Commonwealth participants should above all clearly define their views on the problems of ensuring national security and agree them among themselves. This also applies to the Commonwealth as a whole. In other words, every state needs its concept of national security, and CIS as a whole needs a comprehensive, universal concept.

We believe that each state could take account in these concepts of its geopolitical and geostrategic national interests, ways and means of realizing them, and its obligations to the world community, and define the aims and principles of ensuring its national security proceeding from possible overt or potential dangers and threats and the spheres from which they emanate. It is necessary to clearly realize here that the main aim of the efforts undertaken in the given sphere is to safeguard the rights, freedoms, and social protection of citizens in accordance with the constitution and generally accepted standards of international law, and to ensure the stable functioning of the state.

Thus the national security concept should, in our opinion, represent a system of scientifically founded and officially accepted views on the ways, means, and mechanisms of protecting vitally important interests of the state against external and internal threats and ensuring its independence, territorial integrity, and political stability and its potential for stable socioeconomic development. Let us clarify that the vitally important interests of any sovereign state obviously include interests connected with its independence and territorial integrity, and the development of a democratic rule-of-law society in which economic prosperity and civic consensus will be ensured.

As is known, there are internal and external aspects of a state's security.

Internal security is ensured by means of domestic political and economic stability and nationwide accord.

External security consists of the protection of the state's vitally important interests against threats, dangers, and risks from outside, and is ensured by political, diplomatic, and (or) military measures. In other words it

represents mainly state and military security and presupposes a stance and a situation in international relations which make it possible to guarantee the protection of sovereignty and territorial integrity, ensure the inviolability of borders and of the constitutional system against attempts to change them by forcible methods, avert attacks from outside, and, in the event of aggression, successfully counter an invasion.

The national security of every state is ensured by means of a system of political, economic, defense, legal, organizational, and social measures and the implementation of a flexible, active, deideologized domestic and foreign policy.

The key component of the statewide system of national security is military security. Attaining it will clearly remain one of the priority tasks of the country's political and military leadership.

Each state of the Commonwealth, aware of its responsibility for maintaining peace and preserving it in the future, and realizing that any conflict may have catastrophic global consequences, could, in our opinion:
proclaim prevention of war as the main aim of its foreign policy, and reaffirm its commitment to the principles and aims of the UN Charter and the cause of strengthening international security and stability;
reject war and the use or threat of military force as a means of attaining political, economic, or other aims, and give priority to political means in resolving disputed questions;
adhere to the principles of the inviolability of existing external borders and noninterference in the internal affairs of other states and refrain from territorial claims against any other state of the Commonwealth or the world and from viewing any other nation as the enemy.

It is expedient in any state to implement defense policy and military building taking due account of the mutual interests of all the Commonwealth participants and the declarations of sovereignty and independence which they have adopted, and also refraining from the use of its own armed forces to resolve domestic policy tasks.

The interests of the CIS in the sphere of defense have taken shape historically under the impact of existing potential sources of military danger, and are conditioned by its geopolitical and geostrategic position in Europe.

Various external sources can be viewed as a potential military threat to the CIS and to some of the independent states within it. Among them is the desire of individual countries, or coalitions of countries, to gain a dominant position in the world community or in a region, and their commitment to resolving disputed questions by military means. This applies to territorial claims against the former Soviet Union harbored by certain neighboring countries. A potential threat is presented by the powerful nuclear potentials maintained by a number of states, and the deployment of major groupings of their troops (forces) near the border of the Commonwealth, which provides them with an advantageous military-strategic position. Finally, the instability of the military-political situation and certain states' attempts to create nuclear weapons cannot be ignored.

A geostrategic division of the sources of military danger makes it possible to differentiate between global, regional, and local sources, and in the case of military danger to distinguish between:
global danger—emanating from countries which posess strategic nuclear weapons targeted on the territories of the independent states of the Commonwealth;
regional danger—emanating from neighboring states (alliances of states) which possess massive armies and corresponding weapons; and
local danger—emanating from various members of the Commonwealth itself, and their conflicts on economic, national, ethnic, religious, or territorial grounds.

Clearly, the military policy and military building of each independent state, and the building and training of the CIS Armed Forces must be implemented, and the principles and methods of their use in combat and of their all around backup must be determined, in accordance with the assessment of the military danger and on the basis of the Commonwealth states' mutual commitments to the transition to reasonable minimum sufficiency in the defense sphere and also their economic potential.

It seems that understanding is emerging of the expediency of joint defense of the common military-strategic area, impermissibility of the decentralization of the CIS strategic forces command and control of nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons, the need for strict implementation of arms and armed forces reduction treaties, and the strengthening of confidence-building measures. In the present situation each independent state could, in our opinion, pledge to adopt on a clearly defined legal basis the necessary concerted measures in the sphere of defense policy with a view to ensuring guaranteed inviolability of borders, territorial integrity, and protection of its sovereignty which would not be of a provocative nature, pledging also that it will not resort to the threat or use of force, that it will resolve conflicts by political means, through negotiations, without jeopardizing its security or the security of the other member states of the Commonwealth and peaceful international relations.

By concretizing these theoretical propositions and tying them to its national territory and a specific period in time, each independent state, just like the CIS as a whole, could clearly formulate its political and economic programs (strategies) for surmounting the crisis which we are currently all experiencing and elaborate a nationwide and national military doctrine, and on their basis, concepts of military reform and conversion.

In our opinion any state which has not drawn up its national security concept in line with prevailing conditions is doomed to experience huge difficulties, and, in a situation involving a direct military threat, to perish.

Response to Flight of Bombers Noted

MK1902133092 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 8, 23 Feb 92 p 2

[Report by Igor Baranovskiy and Vladimir Ruban: "Conflict: Aircraft First?"]

[Text] Major General Anatoliy Perevalov, commander of an aviation division stationed in Ukraine, has described his subordinates' actions as an act of air piracy. On the night of 13 February six frontline Su-24M bombers set off from an airfield near the Ukrainian city of Starokonstantinov and made an unauthorized flight to Russia; the pilots landed their aircraft in Smolensk Oblast. The pilots are now in a clinic at Chkalovskiy airfield near Moscow.

The regiment was carrying out ordinary training flights 13 February. The pilots should have returned to base after dropping their bombs on a test range on Belarus territory. However, Colonel Chernyy, deputy division commander, who was taking part in the flights, gave the order to change the scheduled course. At that time there were seven combat aircraft in the air, but the pilot of one of them, a Tatar national, did not carry out his boss' order and turned back to Ukraine. The remaining aircraft entered Russian airspace transmitting SOS signals. At roughly the same time the 13th participant in the action—Lieutenant Colonel Krishtopa, air regiment chief of staff—crossed the Russian land border in his personal automobile. He took the unit's combat banner with him.

The pilots attribute their action to their reluctance to swear an oath of loyalty to Ukraine. Although, according to Krishtopa's wife, no one was forcing the officers to take this step—apart from their relatives. Her husband's unexpected flight was a real tragedy for her. In a year their family was to have obtained a new apartment and in three years Krishtopa would have retired on pension. The couple have an unfinished dacha near Starokonstantinov. They will now evidently have to say goodbye to all that. What is more, the families of the fleeing officers will shortly have to evacuate immediately.

The situation is piquant in that leaders of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] military departments met in Minsk 13 February to discuss the question of whether there should be unified Commonwealth armed forces. As we can see, their subordinates did not wait to see the outcome of the meeting; they decided to act autonomously.

According to a report from the CIS Air Force Main Staff, the command has responded positively to the pilots' actions. It has no intention of handing them or the aircraft over to Ukraine. An officers assembly has been held in the regiment which has been left without a combat banner: It asked for the unit not to be disbanded and for it to be given a new flag—bearing the Ukrainian emblem. Kravchuk and Morozov are said to be happy with this initiative, to have thanked the military for their loyalty to the republic, and to have allowed them to call themselves from now on the Ukrainian Armed Forces' first bomber aviation regiment.

Political & Social

29th Congress of Communist Party Set for Summer

130 Members Gather

LD1702162792 Moscow TASS in English 1359 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow February 17 TASS—A group of 130 communists who gathered in the city of Zheleznodorozhnyy near Moscow last weekend decided to hold the 29th congress of the Communist Party this summer.

The meeting, which proclaimed itself an all-Union party conference, was attended by delegates from Latvia, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova (Dnestr Republic), Georgia (South Ossetia), Kazakhstan, and several Russian regions.

Originally, the organisers intended to hold a conference of representatives of regional Communist Party organisations but its participants voted to call it an all-Union party conference, causing some delegates to walk out.

Russian Party Walks Out

OW1602135092 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1255 GMT 16 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Communist representatives continued their conference in the town of Zheleznodorozhnyy near Moscow on Sunday [16 December] after the largest delegation, that of the Russian Communist Workers' Party [RCWP], staged a walkout on Saturday [15 December]. Richard Kosolapov, one of the RCWP leaders, told IF [INTERFAX] that "the self-nominated organizers made an attempt to pass a meeting of 120 former CPSU members, chosen at random, as an All-Union conference of the Communist Party." He said the meeting was offered to elect an emergency Central Committee that would have to call up the party's 29th congress no later than May's end. The various communist organizations were expected to enter a new body of the CPSU as separate platforms. "By acting in this provocative way the self-nominated functionaries are putting the officially registered and actually operating Russian Communist Workers' Party in a false position," Kosolapov said. Alexey Prigarin, leader of the Union of Communists and one of the conference organizers, told IF that "since we expected the RCWP to act the way it did, our conference was not disrupted." The discussion of a single Communist party's future will continue.

Declared 'Emergency Conference'

OW1602180392 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1623 GMT 16 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "The CPSU continues to exist," says the resolution of the conference of Communist parties that was held in the town of Zheleznodorozhnyy near Moscow on February 15-16. Sergey Skvortsov, head of the organizing committee, told IF [INTERFAX] that in spite of the walkout staged by the delegations of the largest party organizations, the Russian Communist Workers' Party and the Union of Communists, the 130 remaining delegates from seven ex-Soviet republics declared it the All-Union Emergency Conference which decided to hold the 29th CPSU congress in early June and set representation quotas for the regional and republican party organizations. A National Communist Committee is expected to be formed within the next two weeks to perform as the supreme ruling body of the revived CPSU.

The Communist Party intends to begin with holding in Moscow and elsewhere in the CIS on February 23 rallies of protest against the policy pursued by the current Commonwealth administration. Its main demand will be to restore the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Congress Date Revised

LD1802210592 Moscow TASS in English 2028 GMT 18 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow February 18 TASS—The All-Union Conference of Communists recently held in the Zheleznodorozhnyy town of the Moscow region decided to convene the 29th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party late in May, member of the organizational committee to prepare the congress Sergey Skvortsov told a news conference here today.

The congress is expected to restore the Soviet Communist Party as an organized political force by animating "the renovated Communist Party of the Russian Federation" and registering it at the ministry of justice.

According to Skvortsov, "the All-Union Committee [as received] of Communists" has been set up to prepare the congress. It is planned to re-register Communists, and elect delegates to district, city and republican conferences and, later, to the congress.

In contrast to the Soviet Communist Party, this organization will not be part of state structures, claim congress initiators. The All-Union conference of Communists said their major opponent is "the existing regime", and their allies are "all those who are not against them".

The conference noted their task is "the fight against free prices," for the restoration of "genuine people's power—the power of Soviets" and for the "cancellation of anti-Communist illegal discriminative acts," that is the decrees of President Yeltsin on the ban of the Soviet Communist Party's activities.

The conference instructed the united central committee to elaborate within a month "an emergency program to overcome the crisis in the country."

Initiators of the "Soviet Communist Party's revival" primarily stake on the rank-and-file Communists and "local party organizations", but not on the recently created parties "of communist-socialist range".

It seems, they failed to find a common language with leaders of these parties. First, heads of the Russian Communist Workers' Party left the Zhelezhnodorozhnyy conference, then the same did the Union of Communists. Only 63 delegates out of 130 remained in the conference hall on the second day of the forum.

Ambitions of Sergey Skvortsov to declare his group "the All-Union Committee of Communists" are at least not modest [as received], leader of the Union of Communists Aleksey Prigarin told ITAR-TASS.

In Prigarin's words, his party holds a "more well-considered" stand as regards the convocation of the 29th congress, although it supports this idea in principle. If the constitutional court prohibits the congress, it should be held in another republic, where the Communist Party is not banned, he stressed.

In the opinion of member of the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party Vladimir Khazanov, "this initiative is objectively of provocation character". They suggest that all the parties considering themselves left-wing organizations declare their joining of the Soviet Communist Party with the rights of a platform before March 15.

If the parties do it, it would serve as a basis for their banning in conditions of ban on the activities of the Soviet Communist Party. "We believe the Soviet Communist Party has become obsolete, and plans of its restoration are illusive," he stressed.

Committee Formed To Organize Deputies' Congress

PM1802125192 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Feb 92 p 3

[Letter from group of USSR people's deputies on convening an extraordinary congress under the "Letters to the People's Newspaper" rubric: "Organizing Committee Is Operating"]

[Text] The plundering of the people resulting from the liberalization of prices which followed the unlawful elimination of Union organs completed by the proclamation of the Commonwealth of Independent States has brought the people and the state to the brink of disaster.

The desire to avert this has recently led to increasingly widespread appeals for an Extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies—the only legitimate organ representing the country's entire population—to be convened.

A group of 10 USSR people's deputies made such an appeal 6 February. A rally of more than 100,000 Muscovites adopted a demand 9 February that a congress be convened and proposed that an extraordinary congress be convened 17 February on the anniversary of the nationwide referendum on the preservation of the USSR. In response to these appeals, and mindful that over 450 USSR people's deputies supported the idea of convening an extraordinary congress back in December 1991, an organizing committee to implement this has been formed. S.Z. Umalatov has been elected chairman of the organizing committee. The organizing committee members include T.G. Avaliani, A.M. Makashov, V.P. Nosov, L.I. Sukhov, A.N. Krayko, and other USSR people's deputies.

Nobody except the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or the voters themselves—in accordance with the Law on Recalling a Deputy—can prematurely suspend the powers of USSR people's deputies. The organizing committee therefore demands that the republic authorities immediately repeal acts having no juridical force that deprive Union deputies of their powers, rights, and duties, and it urges USSR people's deputies to get actively involved in preparatory work for the congress.

The organizing committee is convinced that all USSR people's deputies, citizens, social organizations, and parties are ready for constructive work to save the state and the people, and will offer the committee all around support. At present the "Working Russia" movement has already declared its support for the organizing committee.

Contact and information telephone numbers will be published at a later date.

[Signed] The Organizing Committee.
11 February 1992.

Gorbachev Says Democratization Still Reversible

LD1902172292 Berlin ADN in German 1522 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] Hamburg (ADN)—The process of democratization in the former Soviet Union could be reversed at any time, in the view of former Soviet party and state chief Mikhail Gorbachev. In an interview for the HAMBURGER ABENDBLATT (Thursday edition), Gorbachev warns: "I think that democracy is in the process of taking root. But I cannot say today that this process is irreversible." Rather one could say that the restructuring of society into a state based on democratic principles is "now going through its most crucial and decisive moment."

In the interview Gorbachev accuses the KGB secret service, the CPSU Central Committee, and the Defense Ministry of having attempted to supply him with disinformation in the form of false statements, with the aim of making him unsure of himself and getting him to abandon the perestroyka policy. "They wanted me to doubt whether one can trust the Western partners," Gorbachev says. However, he feels that he always knew "who was telling me lies."

According to Gorbachev, the "Stalinist model" led the huge country into an impasse. Nevertheless, the 70 years of socialism was not a pointless experiment. "Superfluous things do not happen in history," Gorbachev says. "Our 70-year history was instructive for us, for Europe and the whole world. It is a gigantic achievement, seen from the political and philosophical viewpoint." Of course, "not everything has yet been reflected upon. There is still a lot to be done."

Shevardnadze on Ethnic Conflicts, Refugees

Ethnic Conflicts 'Acutest Problem'

OW1302214192 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1942 GMT 13 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze has suggested that ethnic conflicts be resolved on the basis of international law using well-reputed comprehensive mechanisms. Shevardnadze, President of the Foreign Political Association, made this proposal at the first meeting of the Ethno-Political Studies Center (EPSC) set up at his initiative. He called ethnic conflicts the acutest problem facing the former Soviet Union. According to the EPSC, in the past four years 175 ethnic clashes, including at least 20 armed ones, have occurred in the ex-Soviet Union, taking nearly 10,000 human lives. More regions have got involved in inter-ethnic conflicts lately.

The center reports 40% of Muscovites do not rule out the possibility that "under certain circumstances they would stand up for their nationality.

The EPSC will be preparing recommendations for the Commonwealth leaders. Among the problems to be studied by it Shevardnadze listed the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and South Ossetia, the problem of ethnic Germans in the Commonwealth, and Russo-Ukrainian relations.

The former Soviet Foreign Minister warned "those politicians in the Commonwealth who are pushing for the separation of their states" against underestimation of the possible international effects of such a move. He expressed the hope that the Soviet Union's collapse would not lead to the creation of aggressive military blocs involving ex-Soviet republics.

Notes 10,000 Refugees

LD1602062292 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0600 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Text] Former USSR Foreign Minister Shevardnadze has called the refugee problem the most acute of all the problems confronting the former Soviet republics. He expressed this view at the first meeting of the Center for the Study of Politico-Economic Problems. According to the center, over the past four years at least 10,000 people on the territory of the former Union have become refugees owing to the exacerbation of ethnic conflicts.

The center intends to prepare recommendations for Commonwealth of Independent States leaders. Particular attention in the center's work will be devoted to the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh and South Ossetia, and also to relations between Russia and Ukraine.

Economic

Central Banks Directors Confer in Moscow

Single Ruble Zone Discussed

OW1402204492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1859 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a conference in Moscow Thursday [13 February] directors of the former Soviet republics' central banks discussed preservation of a single ruble zone within the Commonwealth of Independent States. The conference called by the Russian Central Bank was attended by representatives from all republican banks of the Commowealth and the Baltics, save for Azerbaijan, Georgia and Latvia.

During the debates over shortages of ruble cash in the Commonwealth states, director of the Russian Central Bank Georgiy Matyukhin stated that by April, 1992, Russia will be able to provide all the republics with necessary amount of cash.

The banks' directors issued an address to the Commonwealth nations' leaders saying that the central banks should be more actively involved in carrying out the economic reform in the Commonwealth, however, retaining their independence from executive power.

Chairman of the Belarussian National Bank Stanislav Bondankevich said that the participants in the conference had different approaches to the conclusion of an inter-bank agreement. However, he said, they agreed to hold meeting monthly for coordination of "the credit monetary policy for 1992".

No Agreement on Union

OW1602193792 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1522 GMT 16 Feb 92

[From the 17 February "Business Report"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Leaders of central banks in the former Soviet republics were not able to reach an agreement with regard to the creation of an inter-banking union, but they did agree to conduct regular consultations with the goal of agreeing on fundamental monetary and credit policies.

At the meeting, which was called for by the Central Bank (CB) of Russia at the end of last week, representatives from all of the republican banks in the Commonwealth and the Baltics participated except for those from Azerbaijan, Georgia and Latvia.

Speaking at the meeting, Georgiy Matyukhin, head of the CB of Russia stated that by April 1992 Russia would be able to provide the former Soviet republics with necessary amounts of cash (all money-printing factories are located on Russian territory).

As a result of the meeting, an appeal to the heads of CIS member-states was made, in which it emphasizes that the central banks, maintaining their independence from an executive power, should be used more actively in economic reforms in the Commonwealth countries.

Internal Prize Loan Draw for 15 Feb Cancelled

PM1902153592 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by Irina Demchenko: "Prize Draw Will Not Take Place"]

[Text] The draw for the 1992 State Internal Prize Loan scheduled for 15 February will not take place. According to information received by us, this decision was taken in connection with the liquidation of the loan's organizer—the USSR Finance Ministry. However, the draw's cancellation does not signify a refusal by the Russian authorities to accept bonds from their owners and to honor other operations involving former USSR securities.

As IZVESTIYA reported, a few days ago the Estonian Government adopted on a unilateral basis a decision to halt such operations. Moreover, it asked the Russian Government whether it would assume responsibility for this part of the USSR internal state debt.

According to P. Zhikharev, chairman of the board of the Russian Savings Bank, this has placed his institution in a difficult position. Today Russian Federation citizens are in possession of internal prize loan bonds worth 9 billion rubles [R], and across former USSR territory as a whole some R29 billions' worth were issued. To this day, republic savings bank institutions have been unable to divide up the liability for the former Union institution's

commitments among themselves. The problem is that the savings banks themselves were not the initiators or guarantors of most of the bonds for which securities were issued, but merely distributed them through their network and cashed them using money allocated for that specific purpose. For example, the internal prize loan bonds were printed by the USSR Finance Ministry, which then established the conditions for the draw and the size of the prizes, the money for which was provided for in the USSR State Budget. The Russian Federation Republic Budget omits this item of expenditure. The same problem exists for the remaining securities issued by former Union departments: BAM [Baykal-Amur Railway] checks, and specifically designated checks and investments.

At the beginning of January the Russian Government adopted a special resolution envisaging some compensation for losses to owners of predesignated checks and investments for cars. In particular, it is planned to lower the rate of excise duty on cars purchased with predesignated checks to 0.5 percent, and to institute up to 100-percent indexation of sums specified on predesignated checks and investments at the expense of the Russian Federation budget.

The Russian Government has not yet made a final decision on all the questions concerning the former USSR internal state debt to its citizens. But it is unlikely that it will be able to assume responsibility for all of the bankrupt Union's commitments.

Debt Payment Via Warhead Sales Scenario Viewed

PM1402170192 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Feb 92 p 3

[Report by N. Danilov: "We Are Not So Rich As To Trade in Warheads"]

[Text] J. Attali, president of the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, recently proposed what is truly the deal of the century: In exchange for Soviet nuclear warheads Western financial and foreign exchange centers would gradually write off the former USSR's external debt to the tune of $60 billion. An option at first sight mutually beneficial. The West would have no cause to worry over the fate of our reduced nuclear weapons, and the states of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] would finally be free of the noose of inherited debts round their necks.

This idea, unconventional according to all the canons of business and politics, has provoked many enthusiastic echoes in Moscow. KURANTY even noted that "trading in warheads is more profitable than in oil or timber." Is such a claim true? Doesn't it look like yet another manifestation of that habit, so typical of us, of replying to Western pragmatism with lumpen impatience and ecstatic expectation of manna from heaven?

Let me make clear right away that we are talking above all about the sale not of warheads, but of weapons-grade plutonium and uranium, which, as is well known, are the most important components of the warheads. Each warhead of a tactical nuclear missile contains up to seven kilograms of weapons-grade plutonium. The warheads of strategic nuclear weapons systems have two-three times more of this material. This means that the destruction of 1,000 nuclear warheads would liberate between seven and 20 tonnes of weapons-grade plutonium.

In the long term deep cuts in the nuclear arsenals of the United States and Russia are not ruled out. If we now possess roughly 27,000 nuclear warheads, more than 20,000 could be cut. Translating this into weapons-grade plutonium, at least 80-90 tonnes of this fissionable material would be withdrawn from the military sphere. According to data from the American Federation of Scientists, the total reserves of the United States and the former USSR amount to roughly 200 tonnes, that is, 100 tonnes on each side. These same nuclear powers have 500 tonnes of weapons-grade uranium each.

Now let us try to estimate the market value of the weapons-grade plutonium and uranium liberated in the reduction process. The task is extremely complex, since such materials have never before come onto the international market—at least not through legal channels. However, the Western press puts the value of a kilogram of enriched uranium at about $100,000. Weapons-grade plutonium, according to estimates, is five-ten times more valuable.

Thus the value of a tonne of weapons-grade uranium would be $100 million, while that of a tonne of weapons-grade plutonium would be between $500 million and $1 billion. Some regimes in the developing countries would perhaps give far more for these materials. But even on modest estimates, the value of 5,000-6,000 nuclear warheads of tactical nuclear weapons reduced in this way is equal to the sum of our external debt!

Let us go further, however. First of all it important to specify the spheres of use of fissionable materials with the label "weapons-grade." It is perfectly possible for modern technology to convert the plutonium from warheads into another of its forms—energy production. This form of "nuclear fuel" differs from weapons-grade plutonium by its low level of enrichment and the presence of a whole "cluster" of isotopes. Given the appropriate processing, several dozen kilograms of excellent nuclear power station fuel can be obtained from one kilogram of weapons-grade plutonium.

Skeptics will say that possibilities of using plutonium in modern nuclear power engineering are extremely limited. For this, other, fairly expensive types of nuclear reactors are needed, and are being developed at the present time. A fair comment, if life were limited to the present day. But it is naive to suppose that nuclear power will remain for long in the form in which we know it. You can tell this from, if nothing else, the actions of the most farsighted states, for example Japan.

At the beginning of this year Japan embarked on the realization of the biggest "plutonium project" in history. Over a period of 30 years the Japanese intend to create plutonium reserves of 400 tonnes! Why? One of the latest reports from the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry indicated that by 2010 Japan plans to double its production of electric power at nuclear power stations.

What provoked this major shift in Japan's energy policy? The desire of that country's leadership to safeguard its economy from shocks on the world oil market, and to lower its dependency on the import of power sources.

When the signs of the exhaustion of oil and coal deposits intensify, plutonium will become the most valuable energy-producing substance, its value comparable with that of gold! By selling off our plutonium now on the cheap, we would be in effect trading off the energy resources of the next millennium.

There is no reason to suppose that an experienced specialist like J. Attali comes forward with major initiatives without subjecting them to preliminary analysis. Probably, even the scenario involving writing off our debts in exchange for nuclear warheads was also thoroughly calculated. Judging by the fact that the idea was put forward by a highly-placed representative of Western business circles, the "game" with the CIS' external debt is certainly worth the candle. For the West. But for us?

Media

TASS Carries Press Review for 15 Feb

LD1502073092 Moscow TASS in English 0612 GMT 15 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS: "Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 15 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) summit that has ended in Minsk, Belarus, on Friday [14 February]. The CIS leaders met in the former building of the Belarussian Communist Party Central Committee to discuss what should be done now that the Soviet Union has finally disintegrated.

According to the press, participants in the summit focused on the future of the Armed Forces of the former Soviet Union. Upon arriving at the airport, President Mircea Snegur of Moldova immediately reaffirmed his Republic's desire to create its own armed forces, PRAVDA writes. "We are creating our own national army and will take care of financing and fitting it out," he said.

Meanwhile, in Ukraine, whose president chaired the CIS summit, the Republic's armed forces virtually exist already. The same is the case with Azerbaijan where such forces exist de-facto.

Nevertheless, the Army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) takes an optimistic view of the issue. Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander-in-chief of the CIS Armed Forces, told the newspaper that there is hope for an accord on joint armed forces. "A basis for that exists. The CIS defence ministers already agreed on some things during the preceding days," he said.

However, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA believes that the CIS will not have a joint army.

According to TRUD and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspapers, participants in the CIS summit reached consensus on the material and technical supply of the Armed Forces, on the social maintenance of the servicemen, and agreed on a status of the CIS Armed Forces and on strategic forces.

On a suggestion by the president of Ukraine, next CIS summit is to be held in Kiev on March 20.

In the meantime, while the CIS presidents discuss the future of the Army and clarify their economic relations, people carrying placards proclaiming "CIS leaders, give people an opportunity to earn their living" went into the streets, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper reported.

In a PRAVDA interview, Russia's Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy said there was no opposition between him and President Yeltsin. "My criticisms of the government's economic policy reflect my convictions which can be changed only when enough goods will appear on sale, their prices will go down, and conditions for a decent life for the majority of the people are created," the vice president said.

Former Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, who is now the leader of the Centre for Political Analysis, believes that the Commonwealth of Independent States is an entity which is in an embryo state.

"The future of the CIS is in economic cooperation, a common military-strategic space and if only a certain degree of political mutual understanding," he said in an interview with NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an interview with Colonel General Boris Gromov, first deputy commander of land forces, on the occasion of today's anniversary of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. During the years of war in Afghanistan, Gromov commanded the 40th Army that was engaging in the war in that country.

Criminal proceedings that had been instituted against the general in view of accusations of involvement in last year's August coup, were halted recently. Gromov said "the state never repaid its debt, either moral or material, to the servicemen who fought in Afghanistan".

PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carry accounts of a seminar for the personnel of Russia's Ministry of the Interior. The newspapers point to criminals' mounting

professionalism, which is illustrated by the fact that 142,000 audacious economic crimes were committed in Russia last year.

PRAVDA Review for 17 Feb

LD1702065492 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 17 Feb 92

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 17 TASS—"A step from the abyss", this is how PRAVDA assessed today the results of the February 14 Commonwealth summit in Minsk. The newspaper quoted Belarussian leader Stanislav Shushkevich, who praised the summit's results. "Yesterday, we have as never before realised that the Commonwealth of Independent States is a structure without which we cannot survive," Shushkevich said. The newspaper also quoted Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev: "I must say frankly that our meetings and adopted documents are not especially comforting." "By passing good documents, that should serve to enhance the Commonwealth, we have no coordinating bodies that would monitor their implementation," he said.

"No matter what optimists-politicians say, but speaking in every-day language, they are ensuring not the process of marriage, the creation of a single family, but a process of divorce, the division of everything. Painfully difficult as it is during a family break-up, it is agonizingly unpredictable on a planetary scale," PRAVDA concluded.

"Agricultural reforms are implemented by people who do not know the specifics of agriculture and peasant mentality, who first take decisions and then think about their consequences," PRAVDA writes, commenting on the Russian Government's agricultural policies.

The newspaper comments on the problem of dismantling and storing warheads intended for scrapping under the nuclear arms reductions treaty. PRAVDA recently launched a campaign to attract the public to disarmament and initiated the "nuclear auction" project, in order to attract financial resources of foreign firms, concerns, private individuals and public organisations to the drive. The newspaper reports that the international public and business world responded to the appeal.

PRAVDA devotes a page to South Africa "the unknown country for us". From the newspaper's pages Russian readers are addressed by head of the section of South Africa's interests in Moscow Gerrit Olivier, who discusses comments on Russian-South African relations from a historical angle. "Let's look in the future," he says. The newspaper provides a historical-political reference of relations between South Africa and Russia, which have a 300-year-old history.

The newspaper writes about U.S. Secretary of State James Baker's tour of Commonwealth countries. It reports that James Baker is in Uzbekistan for talks with republican leaders. It covers a meeting of a regional conference of the Russian Communist Workers' Party, held in St. Petersburg, a rally of Russian-speaking people in Baku, a founding conference of the Workers' Party of Russia, held in Moscow and other events.

Press Review for 18 Feb

LD1802062592 Moscow TASS in English 0615 GMT 18 Feb 92

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 18 ITAR-TASS—Russian newspapers continue to highlight the results of the Commonwealth summit in Minsk. PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publish several documents, adopted at the summit,—a declaration on complying with cooperation principles in the framework of the Commonwealth of Independent States, a statement by Commonwealth heads of state, a statement by heads of state on coordinating economic reforms and a protocol of a meeting of heads of state and government.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishes several summit documents on the future of the Armed Forces.

The meeting was a success, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA comments, adding that centrifugal tendencies have been put in a civilised framework. "The divorce will probably be smooth, without blood and tears. It will take a long time to part, but there is no doubt that we will part," it said.

PRAVDA carries an interview with Ukrainian envoy to Russia Vladimir Kryzhanovskiy. "Existing differences can only be settled at negotiations, negotiations between states willing to forge normal, civilised relations," Kryzhanovskiy said.

"The partition of property of the former USSR continues. Ahead lie Kiev talks, where it will have to be considered that using pressure politics would kill the Commonwealth of Independent States," NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA writes, commenting on the Minsk summit.

Commenting on foreign press remarks about the Minsk summit, PRAVDA writes that "they are pessimistic about the outcome of the Minsk summit and forecast more difficulties in relations between Commonwealth member-states".

PRAVDA carries an interview with Mikhail Khodorkovskiy, president of the Menatep financial group, who praised the Russian Government for putting an end to subsidies, increasing discount rates and stabilising the hard currency market.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA interviews Chechen President Dzhokhar Dudayev, who blasted Moscow for pursuing a provocative policy towards his republic, warning that "just like 200 years ago, highlanders are prepared to fight Russia and this time we will win". "In the next few

weeks we are expecting Russia to launch another political provocation, that can result in chaos," Dudayev said, explaining that the Russian Government plans to divide Checheno-Ingushetia into the Chechen and Ingush republics.

Tensions are mounting in the Chechen republic as certain circles are increasingly willing to use the "Army card", KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes in an analytical article, headlined "President Dudayev's 100 days".

Certain influential forces are interested in preserving the atmosphere of nervousness in the republic, the newspaper said.

Every fourth Muscovite will be out of job by the end of the year, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes, citing a forecast by the city employment department.

Press Review for 19 Feb

LD1902062392 Moscow TASS in English 0613 GMT 19 Feb 92

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 19 ITAR-TASS—The press highlights today the situation in the hotbeds of tension on the territory of the former USSR, in which the situation has dramatically deteriorated of late. ROSSIISKAYA GAZETA carries an interview with Artur Mkrtchan, head of the Nagorno-Karabakh parliament. In his opinion, the existence of the independent Nagorno-Karabakh republic is an accomplished fact, and "any talks about Nagorno-Karabakh, but without its participation, will be fruitless."

According to Mkrtchan, the Azeri leadership is waging a regular war against the Armenian people. "However, we have always favoured a political dialogue," he said.

At the same time, Major General Ilgusein Ogly Guseynov, Azeri minister of national security, said in an interview with NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA that Azerbaijan would never give up its own lands. "We shall create a regular army, and the whole of the Nagorno-Karabakh territory will be liberated," he said.

In his turn, Ramzan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Russan parliament, pointed out in a PRAVDA interview that it is the mafia clans of Azerbaijan and Armenia that started the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, while the war is being waged by the two nations. In his opinion, "the nationalities question is brought up every time when it comes to the division of wealth, privileges and power."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an article about the war in Nagorno-Karabakh. It recalls that on 19 February it is four years since the first battalion of the Interior Ministry troops arrived in Nagorno-Karabakh. Thirty servicemen have been killed there since that time.

Chechen leader Dzhokhar Dudayev was going out of his way to become president not for the sake of consolidating democratic transformations, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA writes.

"During his first one hundred days in office the situation developed from one state of emergency to another, which is a natural consequence of the first stage of national adventurism. The second stage is beginning, and it is going to be equally unpredictable," the newspaper stresses in an analytical article dealing with the first one hundred days of Dzhokhar Dudayev's presidential rule.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA publishes an interview with Vladimir Shibayev, deputy chairman of the committee for foreign economic relations, which deals with arms exports from the Commonwealth of Independent States. It is pointed out in the interview that the liberalisation of arms trade should not mean the giving up of state control. "Not restrictions, but the strict observance of state interests in arms trade is needed," he said.

Three members of parliament of the former USSR have appealed to release from the investigation ward some of the accused, who are kept their on charges of participating in the activities of the State Emergency Committee. They sent a letter to Valentin Stepankov, prosecutor-general of the Russian Federation, which was published by PRAVDA today. The letter says that since the investigation is over, a further keeping in prison of Anatoliy Lukyanov, Oleg Shenin, Valentin Varennikov, Oleg Baklanov and Vladimir Starodubtsev "will look like a downright act of revenge."

According to ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, Sergey Filatov, first deputy chairman of the Russian parliament, said that the parliament would examine a number of important problems before the beginning of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies, scheduled for April 6. These include the constitution, which "cannot be patched up any more", the economic reform, a package of laws on the transformation of the northern regions and a political situation both in the Russian Federation and the Commonwealth in general.

Press Review for 20 Feb

LD2002075192 Moscow TASS in English 0737 GMT 20 Feb 92

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 20 ITAR-TASS—Reporting about Russian President Boris Yeltsin's appearance in the Russian Television programme on Wednesday [19 February] evening, the NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA newspaper writes:

"All this was called 'An hour of the president'. This time it struck in the situation where so many problems of crucial importance have piled up that the absence of a

catastrophic slump can be regarded as an achievement. Today, however, some experts say the economy has shown some signs of life."

The newspaper believes "the forthcoming April Congress of Russian People's Deputies will evidently bring some troubles to the president and, possibly, problems to voters. If Yeltsin fails to convince the legislators that the Gaydar team is accomplishing the only needed work that was left to do, the congress will possibly try to strip the president of additional powers which were granted to him some time ago. Yeltsin, however, firmly intends to find a common tongue with the Russian parliament he once headed."

Commenting in a separate article on Yeltsin's move to put Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy in charge of agriculture, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA writes:

"People close to Rutskoy say that to accomplish the task as challenging as this one, the draft decree does not envisage the necessary powers, which can be used by the vice-president's foes to get his resignation. Therefore, an alternative draft was prepared in Rutskoy's office, under which Rutskoy should be granted extra authority."

"At the Minsk meeting, it became clear to all leaders of the Commonwealth member-states that without the Commonwealth we will not survive," Belarussian parliament speaker Stanislav Shsushkevich said in an interview with the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA.

Shushkevich emphasised the difficulties through which republics are now going are identical and it is necessary to join forces to grapple with them successfully. "Problems besetting Belarus cannot be viewed separately from Russia because they are 99 percent problems of our relations with the Russian Federation," he said.

Noting some differences in the approaches of Russia and Belarus to tackling military issues, specifically, to creating national armies, Shushkevich said these differences did not run counter to Slavs' interests: "Formally, the Republic of Belarus is not part of the joint armed forces but this does not mean we are not part of them physically."

Sweden "can no longer be neutral to what is happening around and, first and foremost, in Europe. Sweden will be an open and flexible state but will not join military alliances," Swedish Foreign Minister Margaretha af Ugglas said in an interview with NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA. She also emphasised Sweden would develop relations with the republics of the former Soviet Union and above all the Baltic states and Russia, and will extend assistance to them.

Ugglas pointed out that Sweden was compelled to abandon the years-long foreign policy strategy of neutrality because the situation in the world has changed and the European countries have "sealed the supremacy of uniform democratic values." Therefore, Sweden intends to be active and influential both in Europe and in international affairs, join the European Community and alter the basic principles of its security policy.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishes an appeal by Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander-in-chief of the joint Armed Forces of the Commonwealth, to the heads of the Commonwealth member-states not to allow troops of the Transcaucasian Military District to be involved in military operations in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Commenting on recent mass media reports about the appearance of detachments of Russian volunteers in South Ossetia, who allegedly rose to the defence of Tskhinvali against attacks by Georgian militants, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA writes this information was neither denied not confirmed in the permanent missions of Georgia and North Ossetia in Moscow. In the North Ossetian Interior Ministry and the headquarters of the republican guard, these reports were described as "misinformation aimed at forcing the Russian population out of Georgia."

The newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA discusses the February 17 clash in the Russian state library between representatives of Hasidic rabbis, who claim part of the library's manuscripts, and police.

"Why do citizens of Israel and the United States, who make up the majority among the Hasides, behave so aggressively and impudently in our country, openly violating not only international standards but also the criminal code of Russia?" the newspaper queries.

International Affairs

Armenia-Azerbaijan Mediation Begins in Moscow

Yeltsin Willing To Meet Presidents

LD2002104992 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Text] The RIKA agency, quoting informed sources, has reported that Russian President Boris Yeltsin is willing to meet with the presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan this evening in the presence of Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan has agreed to such a meeting. The agreement of Azerbaijani President Ayaz Mutalibov has not been obtained yet.

Leader's Visit Said 'Unrelated'

OW2002121692 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1105 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The arrival of the Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan in Moscow on Thursday [20 February] afternoon is unrelated to the current talks between the foreign ministers of Armenia and Azerbaijan. This was reported by the press service of the Armenian president which described it as a simple working visit.

The president intends to meet the Russian leadership in Moscow, but his spokesman failed to specify whom.

The press service of the Russian president did not rule out the possibility of Ter-Petrosyan and Yeltsin meeting tonight.

Mutalibov Proposes Three-Stage Plan

OW2002123392 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1105 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Armenian-Azeri talks on Nagorno-Karabakh in Moscow have been under way behind closed doors since morning. The delegations are led by foreign ministers Raffi Ovannisyan and Gusaynaga Sadykhov. Their Russian counterpart Andrey Kozyrev acts as mediator.

On Wednesday [19 February] the head of the Azeri presidential press service Rasim Agayev told IF [INTERFAX] that the proposals of President Mutalibov made during his recent Baku meeting with the US Secretary of State Baker form the basis of the republic's approach to the Moscow talks.

President Mutalibov proposed a three-stage plan:

Stage one - a cease-fire in Karabakh, the safe use of communications and the safe delivery of humanitarian aid. No unauthorized helicopter flights across the territory.

Stage two - the definition of the principles of a political settlement. A treaty normalizing relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan, ruling out any future territorial claims.

Stage three - a special political agreement on Karabakh in the form of a special law passed by the two parliaments. The law should define the status of Karabakh as a cultural autonomy in Azerbaijan and settle questions related to local self-government. As for the Armenian approach to the Moscow talks, it is only known that the leadership of the republic favors the participation of representatives of Karabakh in the negotiations.

Yeltsin Adviser 'Not Optimistic'

LD2002120792 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1108 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Feb (TASS)—Galina Starovoytova, adviser to the Russian president on matters of international relations, has stated that she "is not optimistic" about the results of the meeting that began today between the heads of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

She stated at a news conference at the Russian Government that at this meeting "people will be talking in different languages". At the same time, Galina Starovoytova stressed the importance of the negotiation process itself. She does not rule out today's meeting "being regarded as preparation for just such a meeting, but on a higher level".

During the news conference Galina Starovoytova also spoke in favor of the expediency of bringing the UN "Blue Berets" into the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict zone prior to the setting up of similar containment forces within the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States].

The president's adviser stressed that the settlement of conflicts in Transcaucasia could be a "litmus test" to demonstrate the viability of the CIS as a whole. "If the Commonwealth is unable to defend people's rights, then such a formation is simply unnecessary to its members", she said.

Replying to journalists' questions, Galina Starovoytova noted that "Russia cannot stand in the way of territorial claims" made by former republics of the Union as this would stimulate numerous bloody conflicts.

She denied rumors about preparations to appoint her to the post of Russian defense minister.

Shakray Reviews 'Positive' Minsk Meeting

LD1802204592 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 18 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Tabachnikov]

[Text] Moscow February 18 TASS—Russian Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray has described the results of the Commonwealth leaders' summit meeting in Minsk last week as "very positive."

He said the Commonwealth leaders showed "an ability to make joint decisions and create joint coordinating bodies."

Speaking on the documents signed in Minsk, Shakhray said the agreement on strategic forces is the most vital. He also mentioned the agreement on social welfare for officers and their families. The agreement grants them the right to choose citizenship and work at state organisations after their demobilisation.

Shakhray stressed that "contradictions between the Commonwealth states will exist for a long time," adding that Russia will use only political means to resolve them.

He said "the next two years will sober up many politicians and the Commonwealth of Independent States will not collapse."

The deputy prime minister warned the republics' attempts to introduce their own currencies and set up customs offices will not solve their economic problems. Shakhray said the Russian Government believes only a firm ruble can resolve the current economic crisis and has no plans to introduce a new Russian currency.

Agreement With Ukraine Reached on Armed Forces

LD1802225592 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 2006 GMT 18 Feb 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Moscow—Sergey Shakhray, a deputy chairman of the RF [Russian Federation] administration: Ukraine and Russia have agreed on around 70 percent of the units that are to make up the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] strategic armed forces.

The deputy chairman of Russia's administration meeting the deputies of the RF Supreme Soviet in the White House on February 18 further assessed the results of the Minsk meeting as very positive and stated: Even if Ukraine were to create its own army and introduce its own currency there would be no split with it.

Shakhray assumes that Russia has practically no armed forces as the existing ones are not combat-worthy. Shakhray also believes that a feeling of self-preservation is starting more and more to determine the directions of the statesmen's thinking as a disintegration of the Commonwealth, in his opinion, will inevitably entail a military coup d'etat in the CIS countries. Shakhray stated: The only thing which could save the CIS is a strong rouble. He also reported that talks on rouble emission are planned to be held in Kiev on March 20 and underlined that Ukraine in the final analysis will burn its fingers with stamps.

Ukraine Questions Russian Role as USSR Heir

PM1902163592 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Feb 92 p 5

[Report by Anatoliy Karpychev under the "My Opinion" rubric: "Russia Receives Note From Ukraine"]

[Text] This occurrence took place several days ago, before the Commonwealth heads of state assembled in Minsk for a regular meeting.

The Ukrainian Foreign Ministry sent a note to the Russian Foreign Ministry. Yes, a note. An acquaintance of mine was very surprised by this: "What are they playing at?...."

They are playing at nothing. This form of official dialogue is customary in diplomatic practice and now it is becoming part of the Commonwealth's practice, which once again confirms that mutual relations between the former USSR republics—now independent states—are starting to be built according to the analogues of the international code of behavior.

The note's main idea is that Ukraine, like all the former USSR's components, has a full entitlement of rights and obligations, and any state's attempt to declare itself the USSR's sole successor or to represent the whole Commonwealth is groundless and unlawful.

In a certain sense the note can be considered a continuation of the dialogue between Ukraine and Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk and the Commonwealth partners, which was started after the USSR's disintegration.

"I will never tire of repeating," he remarks in his interviews, "that Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and the others are equal with equal rights...Nobody can aspire to the role of a hegemonic leader or guide of nations...If the figure of Yeltsin, whom I deeply respect, is considered a key one in the Commonwealth, the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] as such will soon be no longer.

In principle this in no way conflicts with Russian leaders' understanding of the Commonwealth's essence. They too are always trying to stress that there is no longer an "older brother" but there are "twin sisters," and that they do not intend to assume the role of hegemonic leader or guide.

So why the note?

As I understand it, it is a matter of who is considered the former USSR's heir and when it can or cannot speak on the Commonwealth's behalf. It is known that Russia has declared itself the successor to USSR property abroad,

which is evidenced by the Russian flags over our embassies in foreign countries. Leaders of a number of independent Commonwealth states have criticized the Russian president for not consulting with them when proposing nuclear arms reductions initiatives, although they affect not only Russia's interests. On the eve of his departure for Minsk, B.N. Yeltsin remarked that he was sending his disarmament proposals to the "criticizing side."

The Russian Foreign Ministry treated the note with understanding. I was told that normal relations with the Commonwealth states is one of the priority areas of Russian diplomacy: Whilst we are seeking partners and allies across the ocean, God himself has ordered that we have them and do not lose them here at home.

But the problem itself—who is considered the heir—remains. In hoisting their flags over the former USSR embassies, the Russians were possibly a bit hasty. Although one can understand them too—the embassies had to keep working rather than close "for stocktaking." Whether Russia can be considered the sole successor to everything is another matter. Incidentally, this formula has come into general use.

For an explanation I approached a competent Foreign Ministry staffer who asked not to be named. All the independent Commonwealth states, he said, are the former Union's successors. But Russia is also fulfilling the role of the USSR's continuer in the international arena because the other states, having declared themselves independent, went onto the sidelines as it were, and Russia was left all alone with the outside world.

There are many questions, which is quite natural. Above all they reflect not so much the depth of conflicts between the leaders of the Commonwealth as the difficult nitty-gritty of bringing it into existence.

Ukraine Asks for Return of Sukhoy Bombers

LD1402225392 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 14 Feb 92

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] All media reported today that 13 military pilots flew six bombers from Ukraine to Russia today. Here is a report by Igor Shestakov:

[Shestakov] We are approaching the military airfield near Moscow where six bombers landed last night. The pilots of these aircraft left their Ukraine-based unit without permission. Thirteen men have flown to Russia. They had all refused to take a new oath of allegiance to Ukraine.

[Unidentified serviceman] I for one have already taken an oath and will not ever take another one.

[Shestakov] Pilots and seamen, the military elite, have turned out to be the most intractable and conservative people in [Ukrainian Defense Minister] Morozov's Army. The chief of staff took the regiment's banner believing that the new Ukrainian authorities do not need stars any longer. Now, according to all army laws, a regiment without its banner should be disbanded.

[Shestakov] You have left families in Ukraine. Have you been in touch by telephone? Did you tell them you were flying to Moscow?

[Servicemen] We did not tell them. We simply told them by telephone later that we were all right. We will sort things out with the families later.

[Shestakov] Moscow received the pilots with understanding and commanders have promised similar jobs in Russia.

[V. Ovcharov, aide to Air Force commander] Some people are trying to put us at loggerheads. Today's example shows, perhaps, that they should not count on that. There is a kind of airborne brotherhood.

[Shestakov] The future of the aircraft is not clear. It is only known that Morozov, the Ukrainian minister of defense, has already telephoned Moscow and asked that the aircraft be refuelled and sent back.

Crew Members of Unsanctioned Flight Reassigned

LD1802194192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1552 GMT 18 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow, 18 Feb (ITAR-TASS)—All members of the crews of the Su-24M frontline bombers who made an unsanctioned flight on 13 February from Ukraine to Russia have received a new appointment, and have been sent to a place where they will continue to serve, an ITAR-TASS correspondent was told today at the main staff of the Commonwealth of Independent States Air Forces.

Representatives of the staff evaded making a direct assessment of the action by the 12 who took part in the flight, among whom are a divisional deputy commander, a regimental chief of staff, a divisional senior navigator, and a squadron commander. It is anticipated that an official assessment of these incidents will be given by Colonel General of Aviation Petr Deynekin, commander in chief of the Air Forces, at a news conference in the near future.

Kozyrev on Human Rights in Foreign Policy

PM1902122292 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by Maksim Yusin: "Moscow Proposes To Defend Democracy With the Help of UN Police Forces"]

[Text] Geneva and Moscow—"Today, following democracy's victory over totalitarianism, international standards in the sphere of human rights are identical with Russia's domestic interests and the tasks involved in its democratic transformation," Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev stated, speaking at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva, 12 February.

Analyzing the Russian minister's speech, observers highlight in particular his proposal to increase international pressure on states violating human rights. In the text's final version, Kozyrev talks about "economic and other sanctions." According to members of the Russian delegation, the initial draft mentioned military as well as economic measures; later, the wording was modified. However, the point remains the same. Especially as in the last sentence the minister called for "international police forces trained for such operations" to be set up. Never before has Moscow supported such stringent measures against antidemocratic regimes.

Kozyrev also proposed to appoint a special observer to monitor election campaigns and elections in various states; he would report to the Human Rights Commission on the results of his inspections. "Free elections are the quintessence of democracy," Kozyrev said, explaining his particular interest in this theme.

The minister also mentioned Academician Sakharov's idea—"to set up an independent organ under UN auspices, drawn from among the planet's moral authorities, to examine the situation in particular countries and issue widely publicized findings."

Kozyrev made some critical comments about the United Nations, and this was to some degree unexpected. In his view, the organization's activity in the human rights sphere "does not accord with the new realities." The Security Council fails to act with sufficient effectiveness in this area.

The minister paid particular attention to defending the rights of the Russian-speaking minority in former Soviet republics. He made it clear that Moscow considers this question one of the priorities of its foreign policy, and that it will "firmly and, if you like, rigorously" demand respect for the rights of compatriots in contiguous states.

Commenting on this passage, Russian diplomats stress Kozyrev's statement that Russia will submit its demands "on a strict legal basis." This clarification, as they see it, will allay fears which may have arisen in neighboring states in connection with the tough wording on this matter.

Deryabin on 'Principle of Interference'

AU1402145192 Prague RESPEKT in Czech No. 6 10-16 Feb 92 p 11

[Interview with Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Yuriy Deryabin by Anastazie Kudrnova in Prague; date not given: "We Have Become Used To Having a Tsar"]

[Text] Russia's Andrey Kozyrev participated in the Prague CSCE foreign ministers' meeting for only three hours. For the remainder of the meeting the Russian delegation was led by Yuriy Deryabin, Boris Pankin's former deputy and a Russian Foreign Ministry diplomat with the title ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary. "They are completely different from the kind of people we were used to from Russia. They have sent semi-dissidents this time," claimed a senior official from the Federal Foreign Ministry in Prague.

[Kudrnova] Mr. Ambassador, Minister Kozyrev's name has been listed with those of senior USSR politicians for several years. Is he really a new figure, did he emerge from dissident circles?

[Deryabin] Not at all. We have nothing to do with dissidents. I joined the Foreign Ministry under Molotov in 1954, a year after Stalin's death. Minister Kozyrev is a cadre diplomat 20 years my junior. However, since 1985—and thanks to Eduard Shevardnadze in particular—a new way of thinking has manifested itself among diplomats of the old school. We were given an opportunity to conduct ourselves like independently-thinking people and as partners of western diplomats.

Interference as a Foreign Policy Principle

[Kudrnova] Minister Kozyrev declared at the CSCE meeting in Prague that, from now on, noninterference should not be a guarantee of human rights, but, on the contrary, interference by other countries in the affairs of states that violate these rights should be a guarantee. Does the Russian Government also intend to apply this principle on the Commonwealth's territory, for instance, in relation to Georgia?

[Deryabin] Unfortunately, in the past we very often made use of the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states in order to block discussions on violations of human rights. However, at last year's CSCE conference in Moscow (I led the Soviet delegation) we gave our complete support to Genscher's proposal for the "consensus minus one" principle making it possible to adopt certain measures even against the will of a state violating CSCE principles. Some states, for example, Romania, disagreed with this. We were prepared to go even further in Prague.

We want to apply the principle of interference on the territory of the former USSR. Therefore, we supported the acceptance of all the republics into the CSCE. However, Georgia could not be accepted and, consequently, the CSCE cannot adopt any measures against it as a non-member. From the very beginning the Russian Government has condemned the human rights violations permitted by Gamsakhurdia. Today we are waiting to see how the situation there will develop. At the moment, there is a bloody conflict and there are gross violations of human rights.

[Kudrnova] While the USSR still existed, the center used the Army to neutralize hostile factions. How do you intend to resolve the situation today?

[Deryabin] Our Army should no longer be used to deal with political situations. A suggestion was made in Prague to utilize the UN's experience and establish CSCE peacekeeping units. A decision should be made in Helsinki in March. The situation in Yugoslavia has convinced us that CSCE troops could operate as an effective instrument in the very near future.

[Kudrnova] It has now become known that an uncontrolled Soviet ship carrying nuclear warheads was at sea during the putsch. Two weeks ago, when General Shaposhnikov resigned, the former Soviet Army was without a united command for a period of five minutes. Can we assume that the nuclear weapons on the Commonwealth's territory are really under control?

[Deryabin] As far as strategic nuclear weapons are concerned, they are easier to regulate and are now under the control of the Russian president. The situation is more complicated with tactical nuclear weapons; they are deployed at a divisional level. This is also the reason why Boris Yeltsin and the American side submitted proposals to accelerate the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons.

Foreign Assistance with Conditions

[Kudrnova] The U.S. Ambassador to Moscow helped solve the Black Sea Fleet dispute between the Ukraine and Russia. Can this course of action be applied in the future, too?

[Deryabin] I do not have specific facts about the American Embassy mission. The Americans are indeed participating in the discussion on this issue. Washington is holding talks directly with Ukraine and Moscow. Normal relations between Ukraine and Moscow are in everyone's interests—an external factor should help.

[Kudrnova] Is it possible somehow to satisfy the interests of two equally ambitious republics and their leaders, that is, Kravchuk and Yeltsin?

[Deryabin] Is is very difficult, but it is possible. However, external factors—I do not want to say pressure—influence, and opinions are very important precisely in this case. I am not speaking only about Americans. Opinions held by our closest neighbors in Europe are also important.

[Kudrnova] U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney admits that the CIS continues to arm itself—mostly out of inertia. According to him, in a situation in which most of the national product goes on armament, it is not easy to satisfy demands for assistance. What do you think about it?

[Deryabin] No one feels comfortable when economic assistance is provided on certain conditions, particularly political ones. However, we can understand the American attitude. Whether we can also agree is a another matter, however. Yet, I understand that it is not feasible to provide economic assistance to a country about which it is not known in which direction it will develop, and in which the problem of the conversion of arms productions is not solved.

[Kudrnova] Do you believe that it is correct to demand assistance for the former USSR, a country in which products worth billions [currency not specified] are disappearing without reaching their consignees?

[Deryabin] Many people are asking this question, not only Cheney. Despite the enormous losses, Western economic aid makes very good sense to us in the catastrophic situation in which we are.

Joining NATO With a Typo

[Kudrnova] Information leaked recently that Russia is interested in joining NATO. This information was subsequently denied. What is the truth? How do you view Czechoslovakia's endeavors to possibly join NATO.

[Deryabin] It was my job to deal with NATO at the old, Soviet, ministry. It is still my job to deal with it. Believe it or not, the text prepared for publication read: "At present, Russia is not considering joining NATO, yet this is an issue that might possibly be dealt with in the future." The typist left out the negation, and a logical flaw appeared: "At present, Russia is considering joining NATO, yet this is an issue that might possibly be dealt with in the future." It was not a political ruse, but a typo.

However, this is not the main thing. In the last years of the process of building the Soviet Union, we reexamined our attitude toward NATO. This alliance is a our possible partner in the future, a partner that can support the stability in Europe. When we became interested in NATO in a positive way, without ideological blindfolds, it was our great discovery to see that this organization had a very developed civilian sector. The final turnabout in our attitude toward NATO took place during Shevardnadze's visit to Brussels in 1989.

It would be unrealistic to speak about Russia's joining NATO today. NATO is not ready for that. NATO is equally skeptical—maybe less skeptical—about other countries of Central and Eastern Europe, too. It is understandable. Despite the fact that they do not think of us—or you—as enemies, they are afraid that acceptance of new members would weaken the efficacy of adopting necessary measures. For the time being, we have joined the newly established North Atlantic Cooperation Council.

[Kudrnova] Does Russia mind the efforts of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland to follow a joint course of action?

[Deryabin] When the troika was in the process of being established—and the Pentagonale and the Hexagonale, later on—the former USSR adopted a wait-and-see attitude. We are slaves of stereotypes. I have been working

at the ministry for 38 years. We thought: The Warsaw Pact does not exist any longer—a vacuum has been created. Assumption: Alliances will be established to fill the vacuum. Conclusion: They may be oriented against the USSR.

Today, we believe it is natural to develop cooperation between countries whose geopolitical interests are identical. Despite all the respect we have toward the CSCE, we believe that the architecture of Europe must comprise various levels: pan-European, sub-regional, and also bilateral. We could speak about an imperial way of thinking in Russia prior to the putsch. For example, in the draft Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty that was supposed to replace the Brezhnev-style treaty, we insisted on such formulations as "will not join an alliance oriented against the other party." Talks got into an impasse. Today's draft Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty is really based on mutual understanding and trust.

[Kudrnova] You say that imperialist thinking no longer exists in Russia. Does this mean that for the first time in its history Russia does not need the unifying figure of a Tsar?

[Deryabin] I would not agree with the claim that Russia cannot manage without a Tsar. However, I agree that we have become used to having one. This is a misfortune, an inculcated mentality, that manifested itself during the perestroyka period. We are used to all decisions being made by a single, ruling individual. Everyone used to wait and see what Gorbachev would do, today they are waiting to see what Yeltsin will do.

Raw Materials Blackmail Is out of the Question

[Kudrnova] How would Russia react to a possible declaration of independence by the Slovak Republic?

[Deryabin] Our attitude toward Yugoslavia has undergone a revolutionary change and Moscow is now giving serious consideration to recognizing Croatia and Slovenia. The most important thing is always the way the independence process takes place. Thankfully, the old USSR collapsed in a peaceful manner. There was no problem of one republic obstructing the establishment of others. Tension is continuing in Yugoslavia's case. As far as Slovakia is concerned, everything depends on the specific situation and on how events develop.

[Kudrnova] Is it possible that Russia, for whatever reason, could resort to intimidation and, for instance, interrupt supplies of oil and gas to Czechoslovakia?

[Deryabin] I admit that in the past the tap could have been turned off. I do not think Gorbachev would have done this, but he was surrounded by enough people capable of pushing for such a course of action. They were in the KGB leadership and in the Army. I am convinced that this is out of the question today.

We Will Sell Arms, but Selectively

[Kudrnova] There have been scandals in Czechoslovakia surrounding uncontrolled arms exports. The situation will probably be incomparably worse in the former USSR.

[Deryabin] Supervision of the arms trade within the CSCE framework is a completely new issue. We have to sell arms in order to resolve our economic problems. A great deal of quality arms has been amassed in our country. Therefore, Boris Yeltsin is correct when he says that "we will sell arms, but selectively." The funds acquired from sales will be channeled toward providing for professional soldiers and their families.

Introducing stiff controls is another matter. No one will ever forgive Russia if these arms find their way to dangerous regions or into the hands of terrorists. We were always prepared to condemn all sorts of things, but, as far as arms control was concerned, we began to drag out the negotiations. To date, there is no effective system for controlling arms sales on the territory of the former USSR. It is necessary to create one now.

[Kudrnova] Will it not be too late?

[Deryabin] We cannot impose order with an iron fist. This will be very difficult in Russia, but it will be easier than in the other republics. The other republics must understand that belonging to the CSCE does not just involve a ritual ceremony and having a plaque with their name and a little flag on the negotiating table, but involves obligations that have to be fulfilled.

'Minimum' 'Ideology' Foreign Policy Idea Noted

LD2002122192 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS—The essence of a concept worked out by the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the foreign policy of the Russian Federation is "to bring Russia as closely to the world community as possible," NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA writes today.

The newspaper points out that the concept's brief version entitled "On the Basic Aspects of a Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation" has already been forwarded to parliamentary speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov and to parliamentary committees. The newspaper carries a brief summary of the document.

The revival of Russian statehood on the principles of democracy and absolute priority of human rights are proclaimed to be Russia's main national interests. The task of ensuring the country's security must take account of cuts in military forces around the world, reduction of military presence abroad and the strengthening of the "belt of goodneighbourliness" along all Russia's borders.

Provision is also made for the development of allied contacts with the United States and other Western countries, with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

and the Western European Union. Russia proceeds from the assumption that not one state is hostile to it, and therefore it does not intend to use force.

As far as bilateral relations are concerned, the concept, in the judgement of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, summarises them as follows: "A minimum of ideology and the maximum of economic benefit".

Commenting on the document, the newspaper describes it as an "ideal concept for an ideal state". "It would be naive to think this concept will work in the country where foreign policy declarations have never been backed up by a respective domestic policy," and it is not clear which agencies, if any, are foreign-policy decision makers, NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA maintains.

Interest in 'Near Abroad' After Baker Visit

PM1902144992 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Feb 92 p 5

[Article by Viktor Linnik: "Dozens of 'Whys' After J. Baker's Visit"]

[Text] As is well known, a vacuum in politics is always filled. When Russia does not have its own foreign policy it is elaborated and implemented by others. The recent visit to the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] republics by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker forces us to this conclusion.

The tireless Texan in his stetson has in recent months been engaging more frequently and more actively in sorting through the ruins of the former USSR than we have ourselves. He has toured an obviously larger number of CIS capitals and has been there obviously more often than his Russian counterpart.

Baker on his own is thus doing more than the entire Russian Foreign Ministry, whose envoys prefer to make excursions Westward and not to engage in patching the torn robe of Union statehood. Within our own limits Russian foreign policy looks like an anemic child against the background of U.S. foreign policy body-building, which is pumping up its muscles from one day to the next. What is this—a conscious choice of the role of outrunner in the U.S. foreign policy chariot? Or the dangerous atrophy of any kind of idea of national interests and the country's security?

Judge for yourselves. Why is the United States concerned primarily with the Islamic fundamentalists' drastically increased interest in the Central Asian republics? Surely what is happening there today, in our immediate vicinity, comes within the orbit of our national interests? Anyone you like except the Russian foreign policy department is active on Russia's Eastern borders—that is how Radio Liberty comments on the situation which has taken shape—Worldwide responsiveness and a catastrophic lack of attention toward our closest neighbors.

Why is it the United States and not us that is trying to halt what is now beginning to be the internationalization of the conflict around Nagorno-Karabakh? Is it not our security that is primarily threatened because of what is happening now between Azerbaijan and Armenia? In addition, what Western analysts call the Russian diplomats' dangerous bias toward Armenia on this issue risks ruining Russia's entire Eastern policy.

Why should arranging our nuclear experts' lives by a job for the head of the U.S. foreign policy department, who realized long ago and far more quickly than we did the dangerous international consequences of the collapse of our nuclear industry? Why, finally, is it the United States which is undertaking to destroy our nuclear warheads, as though it should be more concerned with this than we are ourselves?

People object, and probably correctly, that the Russian Foreign Ministry which is, moreover, numb from the structural perestroyka in its own depths, cannot resolve all the problems which have descended on us. The paralysis of power in general cannot fail also to have an effect on the paralysis of foreign policy. It is understandable, for instance, that we simply cannot cope on our own with the destruction of warheads—we have neither the technology nor the funds. But then, one asks, why put forward proposals for reductions whose fulfillment we know to be beyond us?

Covering the miles in the CIS geographical area, J. Baker is working not only to maintain the United States' role as leader in the world. He is working primarily for his own president, who faces an election this year. Under these conditions Bush cannot travel the world a lot—the voters will not like it. But his old friend is strenuously adding points to his boss' political baggage. That is the domestic aspect, so to speak, of Baker's travels round the republics of the former USSR.

But in drawing the CIS capitals, now suffering from independence, into the orbit of U.S. policy and the U.S. view of the world, the United States is inevitably drawing them away from Russia—their closest neighbor and natural ally. It is thus narrowing Moscow's already waning influence and indeed Russian opportunities for foreign policy maneuvering for many years to come. That will not pass without leaving a trace. That is perhaps the only sentence in this commentary after which no question mark is needed.

It is not a question of where Russia and America have totally different interests in the near abroad, as the Foreign Ministry now affectionately terms the republics of the former Soviet Union. It is a question of the fact that for us they are the top priority avenue in our foreign policy. Russia's future security is now being decided to a greater degree in Kiev and Baku, Tashkent, and Yerevan than in Washington and no one else should do our work.

Ambassador Lukin on U.S. Ties, Joint Projects

LD2002094892 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS—"Relations between the United States and Russia should be of special kind because these two states shoulder special responsibility", Russia's new ambassador to the United States, Vladimir Lukin, said in an interview broadcast in the television programme Utro [Morning] today. He was appointed to the post by President Boris Yeltsin on February 1, 1992.

Notwithstanding all the arms reductions, the bulk of the world's nuclear weapons is in the United States and Russia and in this sense the destiny of peace continues to depend on decisions by the presidents of these two states. Lukin said.

A solution to an extremely complex problem—the establishment of a democratic, civilised order in Russia—is the main project for mutual actions of Russia and the United States. This influences the rest of the world, the ambassador emphasised.

Defence industry conversion projects concerning the United States and Russia are of great importance. Lukin mentioned several more important joint projects, including the training of Russian personnel, and the development of the farm produce processing sectors.

The United States which cherishes the traditions of democracy will for the first time deal with a Russian ambassador who suffered for democracy, the host of the television programme pointed out.

In 1968 Lukin was expelled from Prague, where he worked with the PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM [also known as the WORLD MARXIST REVIEW] journal and came out openly against the introduction of Soviet troops to Czechoslovakia.

New Edicts May Discourage Western Investment

OW2002011692 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1848 GMT 19 Feb 92

["Cover Story" from the "Business Report" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "We don't have to look for clients. There are more potential Western investors coming into the office than we have hours in the day to deal with—and they have billions of dollars to invest. They are willing to take a risk, but they are looking to the Russian Government to give some signs of encouraging Western investment, to develop a legal infrastructure that can provide at least a measure of certainty," said Mr. George Reese, managing partner of the Ernst & Young Vneshconsult Group, one of Moscow's leading auditing firms. Although the firm serves a variety of industries, it specializes in oil and gas, with all the majors among its clients, as well as several independents.

Mandatory Conversion Of Hard Currency: An Unacceptable Confiscation

Some of the Russian Government's recent edicts, Mr. Reese pointed out, are particularly discouraging to would-be investors in the republic's rich store of natural resources.

"The December 30 decree on the mandatory conversion of hard currency earnings into rubles—if it does apply to joint ventures—means that 10% of all receipts from hard currency transactions will be mandatorily converted at the market rate. But for certain listed export products and services, an additional 40% of hard currency earnings must be converted at a rate set at 50% of the market rate," he explained. "Thus, for listed exports (and these include timber, precious metals, precious stones, oil, gas and mineral products—the basic sources for Russia's hard currency earnings) there will be a 20% confiscation of hard currency earnings right off the top. Such losses would make it very difficult for any project to be economically-feasible."

Export Duties Too High

"Further, very stringent export duties were also decreed," he continued. "For example, in oil and gas, where most of the interest lies, the export duty is now 26 ECUs per ton [as received], which translates into $35 per ton, which translates into $5 per barrel.

The world market price for crude oil delivered to refineries is $17 per barrel. So, if you immediately take $5 off that, you only have $12 left. And you still have to deduct taxation, royalties and other costs. Such a situation virtually makes any investment here uneconomical. Interfax note: In a special decree issued on February 7, 1992, the Russian Government has set new export duties for gas. The new export duties for 1,150 cubic meters of gas are set at 19 ECUs. According to the previous government decree of December 31, 1991, duties had been set at 24 ECUs.

Needed: Sound Policies With Proper Laws

Another major problem, Mr. Reese pointed out, was that Russia still has not enacted a corporate tax law. This, plus uncertainty as to what the currency laws are going to be, makes it very difficult for Western firms (and Russian firms, as well) to make any projections.

"We believe, however, that this is a short-term situation and that the government will react to the concerns of potential Western investors by passing sensible duties and making other adjustments," he added. "There is tremendous potential in this country and I am very optimistic. What is needed is for some sound policies to be put in place, with proper laws to support them."

U.S., EC Aid Programs for Russia Contrasted

PM1802145392 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by Pavel Golub: "Europe Also Opens Air Bridge"]

[Text] On 10 February the EC finance ministers adopted a decision to allocate Russia $650 million without delay in the form of credit guarantees for food purchases. It will be possible to use the funds allocated within the next few weeks.

As long ago as December 1990 the "Common Market" allocated to the Soviet Union $1.62 billion in the form of food credits, but the use of those funds was subsequently halted because of the political and economic turmoil in our country.

Against the background of the showy opening of the U.S. air bridge with humanitarian aid for the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States], this decision by the European "dozen" might have gone almost unnoticed by the mass media. But the following figures attract attention. According to Richard Armitage, who is coordinating the work of the U.S. air bridge, the total value of the U.S. share of this operation is to stand at $78.5 million for food and medical supplies and $10 million to cover the cost of transporting them.

Obviously, the significance of the actual aid being given by the West Europeans is greater for us. Maybe the Europeans lag behind the Americans in their ability to make a showy gift, but there can be no doubting their sincerity. According to EC data, our European partners have already granted us $78 billion in the form of aid. According to the "Common Market" finance ministers' decision, $130 million is being allocated urgently (i.e. within the next few weeks) for direct food and medical aid to Moscow and St. Petersburg alone!

Here is a statement by J. de Deus Pinheiro, foreign minister of Portugal (the country that is chairing the EC): "It would be unfair to accuse it (the United States) of delays. I think we can rely on the United States as a larger investor (in the matter of aid for the CIS)" At the same time the Portuguese minister assessed our country's possible requirements in the very near future at between $20 and $250 billion [figures as published].

And yet news agencies throughout the world note the "shock" felt by the Europeans as a result of the showy opening of the U.S. humanitarian air bridge, which presents the United States as a kind of leader in giving aid to the CIS.

U.S. Aid Said 'Unforthcoming,' 'Slow'

PM1802154592 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 92 p 4

[Report by correspondent Vladislav Drobkov: "America Gives Russia a Steamer With a Cargo of Food Products. More Than One, In Fact. But the Food Aid Promised in November Has Not Been Dispatched Yet"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 9 Feb—Something is not quite right with the $165 million promised on 20 November by George Bush to provide food aid for the USSR, as it then was. Things are no better when it comes to the $100 million allocated for the same purpose from the Pentagon budget. Ten weeks have passed, the Soviet Union has disintegrated, the independent republics have formed the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States-]...Not only has nothing to speak of been spent out of the funds made available by the President and Congress, but there is not even a clear-cut program for using them. Moreover, the majority of products that were purchased are still in the warehouse. [passage omitted]

So why is the United States so unforthcoming and slow in the matter of assisting the changes, the transformation of yesterday's enemy into a partner and even—as the Russian president, who was here a few days ago, said—ally of the United States? After all, this transformation has already saved the U.S. Administration tens of billions of dollars in military expenditure alone.

I fear that we ourselves are to blame for the Americans' tardiness. Yesterday's superpower disintegrated too quickly and easily, causing bewilderment and perplexity in the outside world. The United States simply does not see any need to give emergency assistance to a country whose might was only recently being brandished in the faces of the legislators in an effort to secure bigger approrpriations for defense.

There is another possible reason, also connected with the rapidity of the USSR's collapse. The departure of a potential enemy of the United States from the international arena cost Washington so little in terms of money and effort that there is a great temptation among certain forces here not to be in any hurry to assist the remnants of the "empire of evil." Let them fragment and crumble further. So that they may never again provide military, political, or economic competition for the sole superpower.

Lack of Russian Ports Affects Sea-Borne Aid

PM1802141592 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandr Dergachev: "One More Black Sea Port Will Probably Appear in Taman"]

[Text] When I watch eight diesel ships with grain from the United States and Canada (and that is about 400,000 tonnes) waiting for their turn to be unloaded at the outer roadstead of Tsemesskaya Bay various thoughts occur to me.

I remember Russian Vice Premier Ye. Gaydar's words to the effect that by January this year there were 7.4 million tonnes of grain left together with the seeds in the state granaries—scarcely more than a month's supply...so all

hope of a "bumper supply of grain" emanates from across the ocean. It has come and on time. But again there is a problem: Since the partition of the USSR Russia has virtually no sea ports left where the grain ships could be unloaded promptly.

The former USSR invested many billions in the development of ports in the Baltic republics and the Crimea but paid no attention to Novorossiysk. And now, as they say, all the points have been switched toward it. The throughput capability of the port's elevator facilities, A. Ugryumov, chief of the kray grain products administration, asserts, is about 6 million tonnes—only a small amount! As a temporary measure it is planned to use the steppe elevators to handle the grain coming by sea.

Are there options for the radical solution of the problem? According to V. Korzh, chief engineer at the Novorossiysk trade port, in April a decision should be taken on the general development of the Novorossiysk transport complex (port, railroad, motor transport and river transport workers). As a result the port's throughput capability will increase fivefold and billions in currency investments will be required. The port's chief engineer, Korzh, believes that the Russian Government should give foreign investors guarantees on this score. These investors—Italian and Swedish companies, Cypriots, Germans, and businessmen from Saudi Arabia—are already displaying great interest in creating a joint-stock company first at the Novorossiysk base and then possibly in Taman, where seamen selected the excellent harbor back in ancient times.

Meanwhile ships with grain are waiting on the outer roadstead of Tsemesskaya Bay—waiting to be unloaded although compared with previous times a fantastic tempo has been set—if it is not raining 350-400 cars are unloaded and set off immediately for their destination. Today, alas, that is not enough.

Sugar Supplies Low; Cuban Shipment Expected

LD1302181592 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 11 Feb 92

[Text] No delivery of sugar is expected to Moscow this month. It was stated by a Moscow enterprise dealing in the wholesale trading of sugar that Ukraine and Moldova have refused to make deliveries, saying that they do not have enough for themselves. Ukrainian sugar could appear, however, but it will be from the next harvest, and in the fourth quarter of the year.

The Russian Government has not allocated any hard currency toward the purchase of sugar from abroad. As a result, no vessels have left the ports of Western European countries, although supply agreements were made with them. The situation is extremely alarming: The remaining sugar will only be enough for two weeks at enterprises in the Moscow food industry.

It has been established that 500,000 tonnes of raw sugar are on the way from Cuba, but transportation from there will take one and a half months, and processing will take another month. So the sugar will arrive late. This information was published this morning by the Moscow newspaper KURANTY.

[Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1100 GMT on 12 February adds the following: "Cuba has started supplying raw sugar to Russia. The first ship, carrying 28,000 tonnes of the sweet freight, is already en route. Over the next four months 500,000 tonnes of Cuban sugar will be arriving in Russia in exchange for 900,000 tonnes of oil. Cuban sugar used to cost Russians four times that amount."]

Federation Affairs

Yeltsin Interviewed on Current Issues

LD1902221492 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1850 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Interview with Russian Federation President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin by Oleg Maksimovich Poptsov, chairman of the all-Russian television and radio company; date and place not given; from the "Presidential Hour" program—recorded]

[Text] [Poptsov] First of all, Boris Nikolayevich, we are grateful that you have found the time to reply to questions from Russian Television.

We live in stormy times. I have noticed that, apart from the usual calendar by which society lives, the president seems to have a calendar of his own. It is counted according to his deeds and his actions. Accordingly, we have the president's first 100 days, then the president's first year. One more date has appeared: the Russian Congress of People's Deputies, when you took upon yourself the duties as head of government. That was an unexpected step. It caused something of a state of shock. Now we have had the first 100 days of the government you head.

Before I ask you the main question, I would like to ask you a sub-question. Do you regret making this decision at the congress?

[Yeltsin] Well, Oleg Maksimovich, first I would like to respond to your point about my accepting the invitation to meet you on Russian television. I think our meeting has been delayed for a rather long time, and I am to blame for this. Therefore, let me state that there have not been any special reasons on my part. It is just the way things have happened. As we agreed yesterday, we should meet more regularly on radio and television. The president will speak and inform the population about the problems that exist and the measures we are taking. I will now reply to your question.

I have grown even more convinced than I was at the moment I made the proposal at the Russian Congress of People's Deputies that this step was essential. The government could have been swept away already, but I

believe that the sort of government it was necessary to form at that time has been formed. People from the old structures who were raised before would not have been able to keep the reform going for even a month. They would have retreated immediately. They would have retreated immediately at any manifestation of dissatisfaction anywhere. That was the chief scourge of the reform. Those first people, those who thought up the reform, did not stay the course. This government has stood its ground. I believe that today it is pursuing the policy we need to follow.

Yes, it has been difficult, because we delayed carrying out reforms for at least seven years. Yes, all the Union structures have collapsed and everything has landed on Russia. That is not easy. Yes, the CPSU has not left the arena, unfortunately, but some structures have gone underground, as they say, and are starting to come out now. They are taking to the squares and streets to perform various acts of sabotage to prevent the reforms from working in the regions, to constantly create an atmosphere of pressure on the government, the president, and so on, in order to complicate our work. This is all the more reason for the president to stand beside his government and to defend it. That is simply my duty as president, above all.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, when there is such confidence, it is passed on not only to the government but to society as well. I think that last Thursday there was a very serious meeting of the government in which the first 100 days was reviewed and reform was discussed. As I recall, being present at this meeting, I noted that the most insistent person there during the government's report-back session was the president. I would like to ask you one main question: How do you evaluate these first 100 days of the reform? How do you evaluate its successes? Did you have any surprises? Do you see any miscalculations?

[Yeltsin] First, I do not think that I was insistent, to use your term, just during the government meeting. Second,...

[Poptsov, interrupting] The question is of great interest to people.

[Yeltsin] Yes. The reform is not 100 days old, but six weeks.

[Poptsov] The government is 100 days old.

[Yeltsin] But that is different. You said the reform. The reforms are six weeks old. They started on 2 January. It is a hard step for everyone, for absolutely everyone, but hardest of all for the people. Criticism can be sustained when there are difficulties with food, and when it really seems to people, especially those with low paid, with low budgets, that there is no way out. It is a big disaster. We have very seriously analyzed the six weeks, very seriously—not just at the government meeting, but before that, too, in all aspects.

Yes, I had a lot of questions, but not so many so that I could get an answer, but rather give an answer to everyone else or to society, since I knew the answer—in order to focus the attention of the government, all members of the government, on precisely those questions to which attention had to be directed. [sentence as heard] We embarked on reforms in a period that was unfavorable to us in all respects. I spoke of the disintegration of the Union, the crisis, the very deep crisis in everything, the uncertain state of society. No matter how many parallels in the world we have studied, Oleg Maksimovich, there is no longer anything in the world like Russia, which has been under a totalitarian regime for over 70 years. There is no such country in the world. It is impossible to take standard models and transfer them to our reforms.

Incidentally, the very first days, from 2 January, showed how many Western economists, strong economists, were wrong, including those who have carried through such reforms in many other countries such as Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, Spain, Italy, Argentina, Brazil, and many other countries. They said prices would rise gradually from 2 January for six months and then would stabilize; then, by autumn or by the end of the year, a reduction would occur and, accordingly, an improvement in people's lives would begin. The first thing that happened here was that prices shot up on 2 January and reached the top. This is what I would call the first apparent economic paradox. The command system, which was still in existence, played a part in this. All the state trade monopolies were in existence. They dictated prices from above. To be on the safe side, they set fantastic and unimaginable prices in order to see whether or not the people would stand them. That is why we saw meat at 250 rubles, butter at 200 to 250 rubles, and so on in individual regions of Russia.

We knew it was possible that this would happen, but we deliberately did not abolish all those state trade structures; otherwise we would have had a vacuum. However, from that moment—2 or 3 January—we began abolishing them. We have now abolished all of them, giving a legal status only to shops. Now there is a direct line between the shop and the buyer, between the shop and some sort of wholesale depot, or between the shop and the farmers. Strictly speaking, this is the short link that should exist to provide foodstuffs and other goods. Accordingly, we drew the conclusion that we must now keep an eye on things everywhere, to ensure that this monopolization of trade is eliminated.

The second conclusion is that the state system of heavy industry has undoubtedly been most strong here. Society—man—was working all the time for the sake of the state, for the sake of metal, for the sake of pig iron, and for the sake of all other state priorities. At last we have changed. We have turned it the other way round. Now the state is there for the sake of man.

Accordingly, these monopolized major structures have remained in our country. That is why antimonopoly

committees have been established. Of course they are unnecessarily subordinate to the Supreme Soviet. These committees are purely executive bodies. They are hampering us somewhat in that they are subordinate [to the Supreme Soviet]. I think that I, together with the Supreme Soviet, will resolve this matter. I have spoken preliminarily to Chairman Khasbulatov. He is in agreement that it is necessary to demonopolize now to a maximum extent, especially state structures. This is even more so for trade, in some spheres that are related to the world of trade and agriculture, in processing industries, in the food and milk industries, in transport, in the social sphere, in communal services, and in public catering. I think that we will complete this in February and that we have drawn the appropriate conclusion.

Further, it must be said in regard to social protection that even though we have taken measures, we have also insufficiently allowed for some bureaucratic aspects of the system that has arisen. We made the decision to raise the minimum pension from 1 December a little too soon. Even today, out of 35 million pensioners this decision has reached only 26 million. Another 9.5 million pensioners have so far not benefitted.

Why? The system of recalculating pensions is so very complicated that it will take no less than two months. Accordingly, we have drawn conclusions immediately.

For January, we made a one-time payment, without recalculating the pensions, of an additional 120 rubles for each pensioner; for February this is 200 rubles; for March it is another 200 rubles—without recalculating pensions. After that we are to think out the entire system of recalculating pensions so that there will not be... [changes thought] because these structures are very underdeveloped in our country. Indeed, such a recalculation occurs perhaps once in 10 years. That is why they were not ready for such an assault. This is, among other things of course, a certain oversight by the government, too.

We have corrected that as well. We are moving onward.

Regarding motivation for enterprises to increase output, this is probably one of the most difficult problems. In the social sphere there is public welfare and how to stimulate increased production, because it is in decline. Last year, it fell by 2.2 percent, and in January the fall accelerated. This is what we should do. We have decided that enterprises ensuring either stable or increasing production will enjoy tax concessions. Regarding the value-added tax, at 28 percent, I think that this is a temporary matter. Probably in the second half of the year, we will conduct a serious review of our position, especially since many foreign economists and ours believe that it has become too heavy a burden on industry, which indeed it has. Some industries have to be supported by the state. Metallurgy and aircraft-building are finding it especially difficult now. I saw yesterday that the space industry also has numerous problems. Light industry and food and processing need support.

The next conclusion is that the legislative support for privatization has been dragged out, meaning the enactment of vital normative documents. It has been delayed. It has been delayed psychologically. It has been drummed into people's heads from early childhood that private property is the main evil of our life, and it is not that easy to undergo restructuring after two or three generations and to carry out privatization, to introduce private property and private ownership of land. At the same time, there are more people interested in it than the process of privatization can satisfy. We seem to have removed the last barriers now. I am addressing heads of administration now, too. It is written there, for instance, to carry out privatization through auctions only, but this is not always enforceable. It is a complex procedure from the organizational point of view. Should every shop go through auctions? This is wrong. Heads of administration should take this matter upon themselves. Perhaps we will correct them by corresponding decrees and decisions by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. This should be at the administration's discretion; either they go through auctions or simply become the property of those honest people in whom the administration has trust.

[Poptsov] [words indistinct]

[Yeltsin] Ground has been knocked out from under mafia structures and dealers now regarding resale and speculation. Since goods have market prices now—they do not have two prices, one set by the state and the other by the market—it is very difficult for such people to buy in one place and sell in another. This is not the case any more. This step alone has knocked out the social basis for speculation. Therefore, the mafiosi have rushed to look for some other ways, such as privatizing restaurants, shops, domestic services, or transport. This should be excluded. Of course, when ascertaining into which hands this or that establishment is being sold, this should be approached very carefully so that later we do not have serious distortions in this area.

There are many other conclusions. Of course there is a conclusion about greater social support. This is a very serious conclusion. We understand that pensioners have the hardest time of all now.

The industrial sector does have profits. We lifted wage restrictions. Industry does have the opportunity to motivate workers and accordingly raise wages. However, the state-supported sector, the pensioners, have no defense. We have just taken some additional measures. I have told the pensioners that they will see an extra 200 rubles in February and 200 in March. Furthermore, students, post-graduates, and others in education will get from 145 to 200 rubles extra. The very elderly, over 80, will get 228 rubles extra. Low-income families with children will get an extra 100 rubles.

Everything additional that has now been adopted and is being adopted following discussion within the government does not in the least indicate any kind of fundamental modification of reform. No, the fundamental

positions of reform remain. The additional things are, I would say, either technical details of some kind, their amplification, or additional social-welfare measures in order to forestall any distortions. They are several local modifications that, in general, must always take place in life, especially when there is such a reform and under the unique conditions in which it is occurring. The main thing is not to move away from reform. That is the main thing. I ask you to support it.

[Poptsov] We are trying to, Boris Nikolayevich. I do not think that there is a single program in which we have not covered the reforms sympathetically. The government has an idiosyncratic way of seeing it. This is what worries me—and not only me but several others as well. A member of the government, a senior official, can have a 35-minute slot on television, but if we edit out of these 30 [as heard] minutes even one phrase, then he says that we edited out that phrase specially. There is something else of concern to me. There is a certain degree of mistrust by members of the government in the authoritativeness of their words. If they think that a 20-second item on the "Vesti" newscast can prevail over what a senior government official spent 30 minutes saying—well, it does not happen that way.

[Yeltsin] I do not think you can have any complaints against me in this respect. I understand the situation of the mass media.

In society, there is a totally different understanding of all of these problems. A real democratization of the whole of society is under way, including a democratization of the mass media. In this situation, there may be some exaggerations. This is absolutely natural.

I think that everything is proceeding along a smooth path that the mass media have not travelled for decades. They rubber-stamped one after the other, moved when they were given the order, were told what to do every day, and were given the go-ahead for broadcasts. This has ended and it will not return. Therefore, businesslike cooperation and objective information are good things. At this difficult time for people, I would look for a pleasant attitude from those who broadcast on television, be this the presenter or the commentator. There should be a smile, a shared feeling that times are hard for people and will continue to be hard for some time.

I, for one, do not completely agree with the optimistic conclusion at the government meeting during Gaydar's [Russian deputy prime minister] report to the effect that the ruble is already stabilizing in our country and prices are falling. No, I would not share such optimism. We have yet to go through difficult and hard times, very difficult ones. Therefore, it is premature to believe that after a month and a half, we are already beginning to bring prices down or that they are beginning to fall by themselves. Yes, there was a fall after the maximum price, which was artificially raised, but this is not a natural market fall. The thing is that the command system was removed and prices are somehow already moving toward a market balance and market relations. Therefore, one should be more cautious. Although there are optimistic moments, it is too early to voice optimism right now. We have still to live through this year.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, you understand perfectly well that a man will perceive everything through his own experience. The day before yesterday, I took my shoes in for repair. I used to pay 2 rubles, 20 kopeks for such repairs. Yesterday I paid 40 rubles. You understand that when a working man looks at the figures that show that prices are up three to five times on average and then rushes out looking for those products that have gone up in price three to five times, he sees that wherever he goes the prices are actually 10, 15, or 20 times higher. This is what we are talking about.

[Yeltsin] Perhaps the premise here is not quite right. You have noticed that the prices were growing last year, beginning almost from the start of the year or from spring, without any reform. If we are to look at the spring of last year—in other words, a period sufficiently long ago when people were used to certain prices—then we could say that they have indeed grown 10 to 15 times. Do you understand? If we are to look at the prices just before 2 January and today, then this is only five, six, or seven times. It depends on how you calculate it. After all, everyone calculates as he likes. The main, objective evaluation is the way the people calculate this, what percentage they allocate from their budget for shoes, repairs, or food. More than 80 percent now goes for food. This is not normal in a society. This means that today a person is wearing an old jacket, old shoes, and old trousers. There are some things saved from the old days, but they will run out. Therefore, we should not be predicting just now that the process of stabilization has already begun—under no circumstances.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, getting back to the government meeting, it was a main meeting. Another question is about land reform. We had two congresses: the congress of farmers and the congress of chairmen of collective farms and state farm managers. There were essentially two opposite views on agrarian policy and land reform. I want like to ask you: At this stage, how do you see the possibility of reconciliation of these two streams, both as president and as leader of the government?

[Yeltsin] I think that no reconciliation should be sought. You see, everyone believed that our people were more stupid than they really are. Regrettably, this is what they believed, particularly in the West. They believed that they would not understand the reforms at all and that they would see the reforms only in terms of prices. Our people have vast potential. That is why our people have started to understand that the reform is for them, that ownership is for them—but not everyone.

There are monopolies in industry and agriculture. The monopoly-holders do not want to give up the collective and state farms. We do not want that either. If they are

working well, they need to be supported. The ones that are unprofitable must give the land up to the peasants or the townspeople who want to cultivate it. The process is difficult and agonizing because certain communist leaders have entrenched themselves in the regions and are beginning to put the brakes on land reform there, believing that all this is a departure from the principles of socialism. Yes, it is a departure. We are not striving to abide by communist principles now. That is not our aim. At the same time, we are not striving to persecute anyone for the views and outlook on the world that they may have today. However, there is no turning back now. That would be futile.

A few days ago I had a good discussion with Vice President Rutskoy. He really is the sort of person who has a lot of energy. He and I agreed that even though it is not quite his area, he is to be entrusted with agricultural reform. The media are already saying maliciously that this is like the Ligachev scenario, even though his instructions are not to push through the sowing or to push through the harvesting but are in line with the Constitution. The president instructs the vice president and he works under these instructions. Let him travel throughout the whole of Russia. Where things are bad, he can put things in place; he can help farmers. Thus, he can help village people as well and support those who have good farms, who work normally. This is a huge job. I think it will take up to 24 hours a day. Let him work at this.

[Poptsov] It is organizational work.

[Yeltsin] Absolutely right. Now the time of words has ended. We will judge and appraise him according to his deeds. I have already warned the government to support him in this regard. People are asking for garden plots for spring. I remember after the end of the war they planted potatoes and vegetables on any plot of land—in woods, even next to roads. In Moscow and St. Petersburg, they have resolved the issue. There are around 100,000 such plots of land there. In other towns and oblasts, the people are literally just picking up shovels. Instead of going to rallies, they are going to dig. This is as natural for people as, I would say, self-defense.

We will provide bread. Here on Russian television, I would like to tell all inhabitants of Russia that they should not worry. At any time we have a permanent stock of grain and flour for bread baking for 25 to 30 days. We do not reduce this. People should not worry about bread. There will be bread. What is most important, there will never be starvation. Many of our people lived through the period during and after the war, as I did, where for 10 years they suffered very bad hunger.

[Poptsov] You are not worried that in a month, sowing starts, and there may be a situation where a huge area will not be sown?

[Yeltsin] In the first place, it is necessary to work well for this and remove a number of problems. The first problem, I think, is that the bank has delayed short-term credits for farmers, peasant holdings, collective farms, and state farms, and short-term credits for sowing. I understand that a tight credit policy is being pursued. This is very correct from the point of view of the reform, but now we have to buy fuel to have in reserve for the sowing season. We have to buy spare parts and rubber to keep in reserve. We have to renovate a number of pieces of equipment. There is not enough money for this in the current funds. As for long-term credit, we say that we have to be more careful here, because we will no longer subsidie, as we used to give indemnities for all the credit. Everybody just used that to take what they wanted all the time and then said: Oh, the state will write it off. That is over. We have ended those indemnities with effect from 1 January.

Of course, we must not permit any breakdown in fuel supplies. We must ensure that we have supplies for ourselves, even if it means a shortfall in deliveries to somewhere abroad. We are certain of that.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, let us now move away from these purely domestic affairs and go slightly beyond Russia's borders. Was it hard in Minsk?

[Yeltsin] Naturally, I cannot deny that it was difficult there. You see, many people here evaluate relations between Russia and Ukraine, and between others too, from the standpoint of old unionist traditions when all states marched in a single file, in a single line. Those times have gone. One should not make such evaluations. One should respect Ukraine's position and opinions. One should build relations in such a way that they are normal and businesslike, respecting positions and supreme soviets' decisions, including the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet's decisions. One should proceed from such a position. We cannot possibly wage war on Ukraine! This is absurd. This is impermissible and this will not happen. Therefore, one must proceed step by step, in a civilized way.

Yes, it was hard. Some decisions did not get through. A total of 15 decisions got through instead of the 14 that were planned, but the structure was different.

Almost half of the military questions were postponed until the meeting in Kiev on 20 March, although half were resolved. These were quite fundamental questions. On the other hand, at the initiative of virtually all the heads of state there was a discussion of economic questions, for example, cooperation in railway transport. At the previous meeting no one even raised this question. Everyone wanted their own railway. Then there was electric power engineering, a common electricity grid, and a common system. Previously no one raised this matter because they thought they could get by with their own electricity grids and stations. Now a common grid has been created; otherwise how can one regulate frequencies? If there was a severe winter, many would suffer. These are the agreements. There is an agreement on transit and an agreement on the reform in order to coordinate with each other in some way.

Each time there is a step forward in our relations, but sometimes, of course, things do not happen as we would like. That is very difficult. Nonetheless, we must restrain ourselves. Russia has embarked firmly on a course without using imperial methods. That period is over. Therefore, we cannot behave in an imperial manner. What is more, not only can we not dictate, but we cannot even give prompts or suggestions or, in general, insist on a particular point of view that is different from that of one of the independent states.

[Poptsov] Speaking honestly, is Russia prepared for an unfavorable development of events if, for instance, Ukraine announces that it is leaving the Commonwealth?

[Yeltsin] Why should we prepare for this—in order to push Ukraine to do this?

[Poptsov] That is true. That is logical. Did your talks with Kravchuk go well?

[Yeltsin] I would put it like this: We had little time, but we worked it out in such a way that the most important work was at the level of ministers and leaders of governments. At the end of the meeting, we exchanged opinions and in general came to the conclusion that we really must cooperate economically. If we do not, so many ties—thousands, hundreds of thousands of ties—would be broken and not restored. This would be a major calamity for both Ukraine and Russia and of no benefit to anyone.

[Poptsov] At the Minsk meeting, speaking objectively, the main question remained the open question of the army. Is there a concept of the president, your personal concept, of a social policy for the army?

[Yeltsin] On the whole, we did adopt a number of decisions in Minsk. It cannot just be said that we postponed them all until 20 March in Kiev. An agreement on the strategic armed forces was signed by all 11 participating states. As regards conventional armed forces—apart from Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova, which want to have their own armed forces—all the others, including Russia, signed in favor of joint armed forces. Russia is not going to destroy that alliance of the joint armed forces of eight out of the 11 states. This is very important.

As for social policy, we also exchanged views in Minsk to the effect that we need to strengthen and somehow to make more systematic the social policy for servicemen. All the same, to a very great extent, this is connected with a reduction in the numbers in the armed forces, including the officers' corps, which is very unprotected. A decision must be specially adopted.

We have passed the first stage. We have somehow protected many people by a 1.9-fold increase. Now the second stage is beginning. I will say frankly, not especially for television, that late yesterday evening or last night, the decree on the latest measures to strengthen the social welfare of servicemen and persons released from military service was readied. This morning I signed it. I think that it will need to be given urgently to the media, so that I do not have to read it in full now.

Here are just a few provisions: There will be minimum salaries for primary officer posts in the armed forces—platoon commanders and equivalent positions. These were set on 1 February this year at 1,800 rubles a month. Regarding the main standard posts, the amount of salaries for people in the officers' corps—warrant officers and servicemen on extended military service—has tripled, proceeding from the minimum salaries laid down by the present decree. In other words, all the rest proceed from the minimum in accordance with a scale that already exists. Indexation of the monetary allowance for servicemen in connection with the growth in retail prices and tariffs is to be carried out in accordance with established procedures, as for the whole population of Russia. An extraordinary grant of 500 rubles is to be paid to fixed-term servicemen on demobilization from military service, while 2,000 rubles will be paid in the case of specified persons from among children and orphans remaining without premises.

I am warning the heads of administration in particular that very harsh demands, I would say, will be made of all executive authorities from 2 or 3 July if anybody fails to carry out this decree, harsh demands indeed. As I said at the officers' assembly, they must settle existing debts for the first half year by 1 July this year, in accordance with the 10 percent that usually is given to the armed forces [as heard]. In addition, there is the shared participation of the armed forces in housebuilding. This must be carried out to the letter. Further, there is a point regarding the allocation of land: 15 or 10 hundredths for gardens and allotments, 25 hundredths in rural locations, and 10 hundredths in urban settlements.

The decree increases monetary compensation payments to officers, military and naval warrant officers, and servicemen in the armed forces on extended military service who are not provided with permanent living premises to 300 rubles per month, and to 350 rubles for those with a family of three or more, to rent temporary living accommodation. Further, there is non-repayable financial help in the place of service amounting to 50 percent of the cost of cooperative housing or of a bank credit obtained for the construction of a private house.

The decree exempts all categories of servicemen from paying income tax on monetary allowances, monetary awards, and other payments obtained in connection with the execution of their military duties. It exempts those to whom plots of land are allocated from paying that part of the land tax which goes to the republican budget of the Russian Federation. There are also a number of specific instructions to the government that relevant decisions should be made within a month. This decree comes into force immediately.

I think that this is the next step. We regard it as substantial, very substantial. Of course, we have calculated everything, such as how much it costs and how it is to fit into the budget. The fact that our budget for the first quarter is very tough is justified, although it is not an end in itself. We understand that it will not be without a deficit. If we could manage to get the deficit to be 4, 5, 6, or 7 percent, that would be ideal for any country. There is no need to be afraid of that or to panic, although the fact that today the dollar is worth not 260 rubles, but 100 rubles on the market already says something. We do not intend to abandon the ruble. We intend to stabilize the ruble and to strive to make the ruble very valuable.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, as it is usual to believe, a very great deal depends on—how shall I put it—unity, on concord within the structures of power. The mass media have lately been overfulfilled with all possible reports—an address by Rutskoy, then an address by Khasbulatov, then the talk round the head of the administration of the president, then about the conflict between the parliament and the government. I would like you and I to talk in somewhat greater detail about these topics, which are very worrying and disturbing to society.

[Yeltsin] First, I believe that we need to be glad that there is no unity. Perhaps I am not quite on your wavelength. We have escaped from unity, thank God, and from unity of thought.

[Poptsov] One would want concord.

[Yeltsin] That is another matter. I, too, would like us to have greater concord. If one speaks about the relations between the president and parliament, I do not see any problems here. We have normal, civilized relations. Okay, they do not agree on some decrees, and I do not agree to sign some laws passed by the Supreme Soviet and so return them for re-examination in accordance with the Constitution. Still, relations of this kind exist in other civilized countries. Is it really the case that each decision by President Bush is approved by Congress? No. Is it really the case that each decision by Congress is approved by Bush? No. I can cite other examples from other countries. It is necessary to get accustomed to this. It cannot be that what the president says is unconditionally carried out by the Supreme Soviet. It cannot be like that. The Supreme Soviet, at the same time, is sometimes late in passing laws. Unfortunately, the legislative base in our country is lagging behind a little. One would like the parliament to work more dynamically in this respect.

I want parliament to be strong and democratic. Yes, the conservative forces are getting a little stronger just now. I think this disturbs the leaders of the Supreme Soviet and me. Maybe I counted on an influx of democratic forces, of even more democratic people into it.

Yes, there is criticism of the government from Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet. I think that this is normal. If the government is not criticized, if someone including Burbulis, Gaydar, or me expects that in this most difficult period for everyone we will get by without being criticized, that is simply naive.

This is true even if everything was fine here now. For example, the United States is not living badly, and is Bush being criticized? Yes, he is. I saw it myself when I was there. This is understandable. The Ukrainian Government is criticized, the Belarussian Government is criticized. Questions are asked at the Supreme Soviet. I think that our governments are not weak in character, even though they are young. I do not think they will panic because of this. No. This should be regarded more calmly. I think that this criticism should be conducted through parliamentary expressions and at the level of political culture, and should not be blown out of proportion. This is something else. On the whole it is very difficult to restrain oneself. Incidentally, from this point of view, I do not have a simple character either. Explosions sometimes happen, I would say, although there are fewer now.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, the day before yesterday Yuriy (?Vladimirovich) Petrov, your head of administration, appeared on television. The myth of the president's administration acquires first one emphasis, then another. I would like to hear from you about your assessment of the functioning of the president's administration and the way you understand this attack, which cannot be accidental. Can you see here the imprints of some sort of forces, or the manifestation of some kind of general misunderstanding, although I have recently become rather skeptical about these being misunderstandings?

[Yeltsin] Well, I have gotten used to replying to all your questions, and not just yours. I will reply to this one, too. I am accused of bringing in a lot of people from Sverdlovsk, for example. For a start, I think it is one-tenth the number Bush brought from Texas. Look at Baker and the others—they are all from Texas. That is why they make a solid team. They work solidly together and with mutual understanding. Petrov is from Sverdlovsk, but subsequently he worked in other posts for 10 years. There are just four such people in different jobs. That is all. What is more, they are not close to the president; only two of them are. Do you think I want to find myself in Gorbachev's position? At such a difficult moment on 19 August everyone from his personal bodyguard to the prime minister acted as traitors. They all betrayed him. I do not want to find myself in that position. What is more, I trust them. I trust them, you understand. I believe that they are skilled, professional, and decent people. After the statements by deputies and the article in the paper...

[Poptsov, interrupting] NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA.

[Yeltsin] ...in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA. I gave instructions. I was given a full breakdown of who came from where, who was from the party apparatus, and so on. It was literally only individuals and only technical

staff. Yes. Are we now going to reproach a cleaner for having worked in the CPSU Central Committee and who continues to work on the same premises, or a librarian? It would not be serious. We are not going to talk in those terms. Now any one of these baptized communists, as I call them.... [changes thought] A very serious threat is now looming. This has to be borne in mind. On no account must one slacken one's guard on this score, because it is a very serious thing. They are already starting to create their structures. They are already grouping together somehow. They do not need to do anything now but play on public sentiment regarding prices here and there and finding some guilty party in my entourage. Never mind—I will have to put up with that, but I will not give up Petrov!

[Poptsov] We are all concerned about the discord among the democrats. Do you not see the necessity for personal steps by you, maybe the convocation of some Russian democratic forum?

[Yeltsin] Well, I must agree with you that there is a certain discord—maybe not even discord, for, after all, some people were democrats already, and they found their place to the right. Some people decided that a democrat is not enough of a democrat, and they should become radical democrats on the radical left wing, on the other side. In other words, this is not a division of all democratic forces, but simply everyone more clearly defining his inner convictions. This is also a natural process. On the other hand, your proposal is very interesting about gathering the democratic forces and conducting a forum of this kind, for me to meet them and speak about the reforms, further steps, and political motives, so that this can be a more or less constant base.

[Poptsov] In April there begins the second....

[Yeltsin, interrupting] Yes, that is absolutely right. It is necessary to think about your proposal, but there is profound sense here, in my opinion. I am very satisfied that Gavriil Kharitonovich [Popov] has been elected chairman. He will undoubtably lead this group reliably, but this is only part of the democratic movement. I sympathize with Democratic Russia, which has always supported me, among others, and democratic transformations.

Recently I met a group from Democratic Russia. It is a pity that they have also split into two positions. There is no need to make a tragedy of this. Formation is going on. What do you think—that two parties formed right away in the United States, England, or France? No, this happened gradually, sometimes breaking up, sometimes diminishing. In Czechoslovakia there are 1,400 parties. Ten people make a party and get registered.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, recently the leaders of the mass media had a meeting with you. I think that my colleagues will not forgive me if I fail to ask you this question. We all came away encouraged and feeling confident that we had met with understanding from the president. A document was prepared into which Press Minister Poltoranin put lots of effort. I would like to ask whether we can hope that you will sign the accord that was proposed?

[Yeltsin] I like this sort of head-on question which you cannot avoid, particularly in front of millions of viewers. I would like to start from a different angle. If anyone thinks that we can do without the mass media or seriously order them about, then they are either seriously mistaken or are simply weak politicians. If anyone thinks that the mass media is such that it will only praise the president, the government, the Supreme Soviet, and the leaders, this is also a serious mistake. This will not happen. On the contrary, one should be pleased that there is such pluralism. Perhaps in places they make too much of a splash. Life will smooth them out a bit. That is understandable. At times the standards are a bit low, too. It is a question of cadres and time. That is the first thing.

Experience throughout the world has shown that the mass media, alongside the legislative, executive, presidential, and judiciary power, is the next power in the country. Undoubtedly this is power —power over people, over people's souls, constantly over 24 hours to form [as heard]—this is extremely important.

It is another matter not to add to the pessimism that already exists among the public. I would not wish that to happen. It is hard enough for the people already. I am pleased with our meeting. It did not just amount to mutual rebukes, which is very important. It dwelt on how better to interact, how to provide you with more up-to-date and correct information.

In this connection I would like to say that, again, LITERATURKA [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] wrote yesterday that Pavel Voshchanov [Yeltsin's press secretary] is leaving for political reasons. They just cannot be serious. They made a mistake in stating that. They could at least correct it. It was LITERATURKA again. He just wanted to go back to journalism, that is all. It is quite natural. I will sign the decree within the next few days. I promise. Poltoranin drew it up. All this talk about setting up a ministry of propaganda—do not even think of it! I would never do anything like that!

[Poptsov] I hope not.

[Yeltsin] Enough of all this about going back to ideology sections, secretaries for ideology and propaganda handing out dressings-down every day. Those days are gone. This will not happen.

[Poptsov] Boris Nikolayevich, we are grateful for the time you have given Russian Television. On behalf of our viewers I would like to wish you impeccable health.

[Yeltsin] Thank you, Oleg Maksimovich. I think that we have had an open discussion, as always. First of all, I want to reaffirm our agreement that we will be meeting

on a more regular basis, including on radio, which is more accessible to all strata of Russia's population. It is a more popular....

[Poptsov] [words indistinct]

[Yeltsin] Why? It is more of a mass media. Someone on a minimum pension cannot buy a television for 10,000 rubles, but for 25 or 30 rubles he can obtain a small radio and plug it in. That is what I mean. I am not talking about whether your television team is better or worse. That is for you to judge. You are the professional, and such matters are for you.

Concerning my health: It is difficult, of course. Sometimes the media notices that things are difficult, but sleepless nights occur —quite frequently at that—and very complex business trips, too. Nevertheless, I have very good genes that come from the earth; therefore I do not intend to give up regarding health, let alone regarding reforms.

I believe that the reforms will win and that this year this victory will already be obvious. There is no doubt about it. I will not go back on my word, which I gave during the election campaign. I will not go back on it.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we are on the threshold of 23 February, our traditional holiday when not only those who are now doing their military service but also those who have completed their service celebrate. This is a holiday even for those men who have not been on the battlefield. It is also somehow considered to be a man's holiday. I believe that this day should be maintained as a holiday and therefore I congratulate everybody—the soldiers, warrant officers, officers, and generals, those who are fighting [voyushchiy] or those now serving on land and on sea, and those who have completed their service.

The attitude toward a person in uniform in Russia has always been a very good one. I would like this tradition to be fully restored. There was a temporary period, connected with interethnic conflicts, when the attitude toward the army changed. We should apply all our efforts to restore this holiday. The army is a common part of our society. One should treat it seriously and with care in all ways. I congratulate everybody on the coming holiday.

[Poptsov] Thank you.

Presidential Consultative Council Meets 19 Feb

LD1902202692 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Feb 92

[From the "Novosti' Newscast]

[Text] Official events are increasingly taking place not in the Russian White House, but in the Kremlin. Today, a session of the Presidential Consultative Council under the president took place in St. Catherine Hall. Its composition attracts attention.

[V. Stepanyuk] The journalists only managed to be present in St. Catherine Hall for a few minutes at the beginning of the session. Nonetheless, most probably each of us managed to notice the following detail: The members of the Council under the president are not only political figures, deputies, current events commentators, economists who are well known in the country, but practically all of them are like-thinking people, people who have supported Yeltsin, Sakharov, who have created the democratic movement and are in the interregional deputies' group as well. Among those present were Gennadiy Burbulis, Yuriy Boldarev, Oleg Bogomolov, Pavel Bunich, Daniel Granin, Aleksey Yemelyanov, Tatyana Zaslavskaya, Mark Zakharov, Yuriy Koryagin, Gavriil Popov, Anatoliy Sobchak, Vladimir Tikhonov, Valentin Fedorov, Yegor Yakovlev. Many of the ideas, schemes, and reforms conceived in the circle of these people have in principle been completed today, and have become a reality.

For various reasons, the Council under the president has not assembled since autumn last year. But at the present time, like no other, it is necessary to discuss the next steps in the reform—as stated in the official agenda of this informal body—of the economic, political and social situation in Russia.

Session Chaired by Yeltsin

OW1902180192 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1640 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Opening today's meeting of the Presidential Consultative Council, which had resumed work after a four-month interval, Russian President Boris Yeltsin emphasized that the council should follow changes in the psychological and political climate in Russian society. "All the decisions we made have essentially been carried out," he said.

The meeting was attended by First Deputy Chairman of the Government Gennadiy Burbulis.

The Presidential Consultative Council was set up over a year ago and was originally called the Supreme Consultative and Coordinating Council.

1982 Bonds To Be Honored

LD1902230692 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 2100 GMT 19 Feb 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] At the session of the Political [as heard] Consultative Council under President Yeltsin today, the political and social situation in the country was discussed.

There is good news for those who have shares—sorry, bonds. Yeltsin's government has confirmed that Russia has succeeded to the obligations of the former USSR to Russian citizens relating to state internal premium bonds of 1982.

Government Discusses 'Stabilization Measures'

LD2002085792 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS—A meeting of the Government of the Russian Federation began here this morning under the chairmanship of Russia's President Boris Yeltsin.

On the agenda is the only item: economic ties stabilisation measures arising from the inter-state accords signed in Minsk on February 14.

'Large' Economic Package Adopted

LD2002142292 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1324 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Krasulin]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Feb (TASS)—A Russian Government session chaired by President Boris Yeltsin took place today. It discussed issues of stabilizing economic ties and overcoming negative tendencies in this sphere.

Aleksey Ulyukayev, the president's economic advisor, told journalists that this issue had been examined also as a continuation of the accords attained by the heads of Commonwealth member states at the Minsk meeting on 14 February.

The Cabinet adopted a decision regarding a large package of issues: using the ruble in mutual payments within the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS]; preventing reexport of goods; implementing a single joint customs policy; developing coordinating links between supplying enterprises and production consumers; ensuring a similar regime of prices, including the use of world prices for supplies of main raw materials; and jointly regulating prices for output of monopolist enterprises.

The issue of overcoming the monopoly behavior of a number of producers was examined at the government sitting. Aleksey Ulyukayev said that the anti-monopoly committee had already drawn up a list of monopoly enterprises which includes about 2,000 such enterprises. The most resolute measures will be applied to those who abuse their monopoly position. The president's relevant decree will be published "literally tomorrow," he said.

The economic advisor said that at the government meeting the issue of privatization was also discussed, specifically a presidential draft decree to the effect that when privatizing enterprises the corresponding plots of land should also be privatized simultaneously. "This issue, we hope, will be solved as soon as possible", he added.

Yeltsin Signs Decree on Protection of Servicemen

LD1902182192 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] From 1 February the minimum official salary for primary officers' posts in the armed forces is set at 1,800 rubles per month. This is stated in a decree by President Boris Yeltsin on measures for the social protection of servicemen. The size of the official salaries of individuals from the officers' corps, ensigns, and servicemen undertaking additional service is also set out in this document, which was signed today and comes into force as of today. If a serviceman is dismissed during fixed-term service, he will now be paid a one-time grant amounting to 500 rubles. For appointed individuals who are orphans or children left without parental care, 2,000 rubles will be paid. All categories of servicemen are exempt from the payment of income tax. Those who are interested may receive a more detailed account in the presidential bulletin for today.

Yeltsin Aide Responds to Resignation Rumors

PM1902195792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Own information report, accompanied by unnamed correspondent interview with Yu. Petrov, date and place not given, under general headline: "Russian Government Considers Yu. Petrov's Resignation Desirable, But Petrov Does Not Want To Resign"]

[Text] The IZVESTIYA Editorial Office has received information that at a working session in early February the Russian Government examined the question of difficulties arising in the work of administrative structures as a result of serious shortcomings in the activity of the president's administration headed by Yu. Petrov.

It was noted at the session that "certain administration leaders have gotten carried away with politics and have been failing to carry out their duties in ensuring the vitality of the structures of executive power." Questions of special communications, transportation, and the passage [prokhozhdeniye] of operational documents of state importance have not been properly resolved for months. During the discussion the conclusion was reached that, in order to eradicate similar problems, it is necessary to change officials in the president's administration who are incapable or unable to ensure normal work in running the state and are thereby hampering reform.

An IZVESTIYA correspondent met with Yu. Petrov. Here is what he said:

[Petrov] I do not want to resign. I was invited to work in this post by the president, and if for objective or subjective reasons he believes that I should not remain in it, I will leave immediately. But I do not intend to leave at this difficult time unless the president wants me to.

[IZVESTIYA] Did the president have any complaints about how you are carrying out your work?

[Petrov] I do not feel that I have done my duties badly. Of course, some things have not been completed yet—the shaping and molding of the apparatus is under way. What is more, the administration has had an enormous amount of work to do in taking over the property of the former CPSU Central Committee: We have had to make considerable efforts to ensure that it was not stolen. Government and other organs have moved premises, which has put a huge strain on all services. The president sometimes makes comments on specific issues, and I react accordingly. However, on the whole I have not heard of any complaints of inadequacy or formalism against me, not even from government leaders and ministers.

[IZVESTIYA] Do you link the calls for your resignation with the claims that you have given support to conservative forces in the apparatus?

[Petrov] The people who draw such conclusions ought at least to know a little of what I do and how I do it. You are probably referring to G. Yakunin's well-known statement-cum-demand. I have never come across him in my work. Nonetheless, the esteemed deputy considers it acceptable at second hand to place me among those forces which are holding up democratic change, and to call for my resignation. He is not objective, and it pains me to hear such speeches from a cochairman of the "Democratic Russia" movement, for which I have great respect. Although I am not sure that he is merely expressing his own views.

I cannot call myself a conservative. I deliberately joined Yeltsin's team in order to jointly implement reform—above all, in shaping the new Russian state. During my years of work in party posts I always had to be reined in. Back at the 27th CPSU Congress I raised the question of territorial economic accountability. At that time such speeches were seen as seditious. And I went to Cuba not because no better diplomat could be found. Somebody wanted rid of me.

[IZVESTIYA] What is your view—are there any differences within President Yeltsin's team today which have resulted in the calls for your resignation?

[Petrov] I would say this—there are people who would like Petrov not to be at the president's side.

[IZVESTIYA] Out of personal dislike?

[Petrov] Of course not. Out of a desire to drive out of the president's team people who are devoted to him—those who have worked with him for many years. This group includes not only Petrov but secretariat head V. Ilyushin, O. Lobov, chairman of the government's panel of experts, and others. We joined him at the hardest time, and we will stay with the president as long as he finds us necessary.

Yeltsin Adviser Outlines Army Reform Ideas

MK1902122592 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 19 Feb 92 p 4

[Interview with People's Deputy Galina Starovoytova, Russian presidential adviser, by Aleksandr Putko; date and place not given: "In Our Time of Economic Instability and Strained Interethnic Relations, in Opinion of People's Deputy Galina Starovoytova, Russian Presidential Adviser, Ability to Resolve Even Most Acute Problems Calmly Is Particularly Essential"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Putko] Reports have appeared in the press that you are one of the candidates for the post of Russian military [voyennyy] minister. How feasible is that?

[Starovoytova] There are indeed various groups of military men from various categories of troops and various public organizations and currents, in particular the "Military for Democracy" movement, who would like to see me in the post. Various high-ranking military chiefs hold talks with me daily. It is a question of separating the General Staff and the actual Defense Ministry, as was the case in prerevolutionary Russia. The General Staff was then in charge of specialized military matters: strategy, tactics, arms, and so on. The ministry tackled what we now call social security for servicemen, that is, food and uniform supplies, provision of information, the creation of conditions for cultural life, the defense of rights, and so on. Many people have concluded that a woman could cope better with the latter task. It is a question of increasing civilian authority over the military authority. There are precedents for this in some states.

I am involved in these talks because Russia's national-strategic interests in the changing geopolitical situation also worry me in terms of my professional activity as a specialist on nationalities policy. To be frank, I realize how difficult and responsible this burden is, particularly now when our army needs in-depth, urgent reform. I do not think that public opinion in our country is ready yet for a civilian—and a woman at that—to be nominated for this post. However, life will tell, and I am a disciplined person.

[Putko] Try nonetheless to imagine yourself as defense minister. How would you start?

[Starovoytova] First, I would visit all the districts and familiarize myself with problems at the local level. Admittedly, I meet servicemen quite often already. There are several military training establishments in my electoral okrug in St. Petersburg. Recently, for instance, I spent four hours answering questions from students at the Naval Academy, and I have visited various troop

units, for instance, in Kronshtadt. I have also visited troop units in other regions, including Baykonyr.

Generally, action must be taken in several areas: First, there must be a real cut in the Armed Forces—something on which President Yeltsin and the other heads of state agreed at the summit. It is above all enlisted men that the cuts must affect. Things are more complex with officers. They cannot simply be dismissed and sent off to all corners of the land. Many of them do not have housing and have no civilian profession. However, Western states are offering us aid in this: They will retrain our officers over a period of a few months in Germany, Hungary, and other states. They intend to teach our officers the fundamentals of business, marketing, management, private farming, and other peaceable professions at special courses in Russian.

I would assimilate most carefully the 7 billion or more Deutsch marks [DM] that have been allocated for building housing for officers today. Our incumbent military leadership is incomprehensibly planning some new defense construction worth DM4 billion. This is after the government has decided to freeze that kind of construction and channel all money into housing construction!

I would pay the most attention to broadening our servicemen's outlook. After all, many of them have regrettably been deprived of a broad range of political and cultural information. The upshot is that they are now going through a grave psychological upheaval: They have lost their former values without acquiring new ones. Many of them simply cannot understand what democracy is and what panhuman values are. An extensive education program is necessary for officers and enlisted men to rid them of their blinkered outlook [zashorennost] and spiritually enrich them.

At the same time the combat capability of the Armed Forces must be strengthened by setting up highly professional crack units on a voluntary contract basis. We may have to change the structure and correlation of various categories of troops, the way in which they interact, and much else besides as a result of the changes in our military doctrine.

In short, there is plenty of work here for anyone who ventures to shoulder this burden. I still think that it would be better for a man to take on this burden in our conditions.

[Putko] Galina Vasilyevna, of late the alarming word "emergency" has been heard. Vice President A. Rutskoy suggested an economic state of emergency. What do you think about that?

[Starovoytova] I have grown sick of all this talk of emergencies. In my view we have been living in a state of emergency for 70 years or more, since the Emergency Commission—the celebrated Cheka—was set up. We have had more than enough of that. You have to be able to solve problems calmly and normally, as happens throughout the civilized world. It is naive to talk about introducing an economic state of emergency without introducing a political state of emergency, without using strong-arm methods to safeguard the policy. I told the vice president this frankly, but I do not seem to have been able to convince him.

[Putko] You are the president's adviser. Does the president listen to your advice?

[Starovoytova] Of course. I would put it like this: As long as the president heeds my opinion and takes just 51 percent of my suggestions into consideration, I am not in this post for nothing. If I feel that the bulk of my suggestions fall on deaf ears, I will ask the president to accept my resignation.

In conclusion let me take this opportunity to say a few words about KURANTY. I love this newspaper. Some people think it a bit harsh and even a scandal rag; I do not think that. I think that KURANTY is always uncompromising and sincere. That is the newspaper's stance. May it always be so. I particularly like your female correspondents. They often take on the tough, manly job of putting impartial questions to people who bear the burden of authority. Well done!

Cited on Possible Nomination

OW2002122592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1105 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "So far I have received no official invitation to fill the post of Russia's Defence Minister either from President Boris Yeltsin or from Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov", said Galina Starovoytova, the Russian President's adviser on ethnic problems, in Moscow on Wednesday [19 February]. Her candidacy, she explained in an interview for IF [INTERFAX], "is being considered on certain levels, and a large group of influential military, such as 'The Military for Democracy' movement, insists on approving it". According to G. Starovoytova, the likeliest contenders for the ministerial post were Generals Konstantin Kobets and Pavel Grachev. But in the past two days the likelihood of their appointment has sharply diminished for varying reasons", said the presidential adviser. [quotation marks as received]

Khasbulatov Interviewed on Domestic Policy

LD1702205192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1619 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow, 17 Feb (ITAR-TASS)—An interview has been published in the latest issue of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA between Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia, and the journal's correspondent Gennadiy Ariyevich, with the headline: "I Do Not Have the Right To Sit on the Wool Sack Waiting for an Explosion...". The interview follows, with minor abridgements.

[Ariyevich] There is much talk at the moment about conflicts between the parliament and the Government of Russia. What are your main points of disagreement with the government?

[Khasbulatov] I am more inclined to support the program which used to be known as the "500 Days" plan. The program gave us reference points, general principles. The main thing that made the "500 Day" plan attractive was the serious, stage-by-stage sequence of steps, the interrelationship of actions and measures, its all-embracing character.

We still have an economy based on a state monopoly. Therefore any attempts to ensure a balanced budget by purely financial manipulations are doomed to failure. We need to get the monolith of state economy moving, to turn it into a commodity economy. And for this we need, above all, a clear privatization policy. We should not detach price formation policy from general privatization policy and the liberation of external trade, as the government is doing now. While the government has not understood this, we in parliament have been working on a short law on the buying and selling of plots of land for industrial construction. And that will apply to foreign citizens as well. Otherwise, however much we try to convince them, foreign capital will not come to this country until companies can buy plots of land on which they can build their own enterprises. Otherwise the enterprise can not be said to belong to them. They will always have the impression that it can be taken away from them together with the land.

[Ariyevich] The current monetarist approach to solving the economic crisis is well known and has been tested more than once by Western countries—in Britain, for example.

[Khasbulatov] Correct. By reducing state expenditure and expenditure on social needs, the amount of money in circulation can be regulated and the budget balanced, if the economy is healthy as a whole. But our theorists forgot that those countries already had private property and a mixed economy. There it was not necessary to privatize anything. Even so, whole branches were moved from the state sector to the private sector.

[Ariyevich] After your criticism of the government people have started to say that you are breaking away. They are also coming to conclusions about serious discord among our leaders...

[Khasbulatov] There is no dissension between the top leaders. There is the president and there is the Supreme Soviet, which determine policy. But the government is a team of professionals who have to implement the will of the Supreme Soviet and the president. Policy does not change as a result of their being replaced. The main thing, therefore, is to preserve the presidential and parliamentary institutions.

Russian society has to recognize that no matter how much we interact there is a considerable difference between parliament and government. And of course I stand in defense of the president. This is what my "game" amounts to. I have to separate the president from the government, especially since the situation has changed substantially. The USSR was still in existence when, at the congress, the president took upon himself the duties of prime minister. So many problems have now been heaped upon his poor head! For we did not expect that we would also bear responsibility for the railway, for the Armed Forces, for the nuclear industry, for space, for nuclear power generation, for communications. All of this was the prerogative of the Union. Frankly speaking under the new conditions the president cannot head the government and go into all the fine points of the economy despite his capacity for work—and he works 11-16 hours a day. The government is therefore run by two people: Burbulis and Gaydar... and we have two prime ministers.

Remember, after the putsch Gorbachev fell angrily upon Lukyanov: How could you do this, when you are the main person versed in the law? I regard myself as the main protector of the institution of the president. And what is the most effective way of all to defend it? If parliament is influential.

[Ariyevich] You tell ministers off as if they were little boys and this does nothing to add to their reputation in the eyes of the public. Whereas today they need support—after all, they are the first people who are trying to do something, aren't they?

[Khasbulatov] If parliament did not declare itself as an independent force with its own views do you think it would have been possible to save the government from defeat on the day the budget was discussed? I am not sure. I wanted to help the government and I think I did so. I said: Do not let them think that they are everlasting and irreplaceable. We demand that certain amendments be made, that is inevitable. There is no need to dig in one's heels. And that is why you cannot get by without sharp observations to the effect that all our meetings with the main ministers have turned out to be absolutely futile.

I cannot, I have no right to sit on the woolsack like the speaker of the British House of Commons and keep my silence in expectation of a social explosion. The more so in view of the fact that I have been engaged in the market economy for a quarter of a century, I knew it even in the days when Gaydar was writing pro-Communist articles.

[Ariyevich] But at the same time don't you still have a desire to distance yourself a little from the government's mistakes?

[Khasbulatov] A great desire to distance myself.

[Ariyevich] And play some role of your own?

[Khasbulatov] No, I am not ambitious. I am put on my guard by the pride of members of the government, by the endless television shows, by the disdainful attitude

toward parliament, by the swelling apparatus. A tougher, critical position has to be adopted.

[Ariyevich] And as a result the former image of a sensible, wise, and gentle politician is changing. Have you changed or the circumstances?

[Khasbulatov] I do not think that I have changed. During all my work here I have been reproached for reprimanding deputies. But I always aim for the result. One cannot tolerate an interminable talking shop. Otherwise, perhaps, our parliament would have ceased to exist. Also a politician and an economist are always fighting within me, and the pragmatic economist often overpowers the politician. I am aware of this but what can I do?

[Ariyevich] So which one of the two made you vent your wrath on "the Fourth Estate"—the press?

[Khasbulatov] You know, honestly, I do not think that it has such a great influence on many people. We receive many letters and people come to us. They say: We trust only Yeltsin and you, and nobody else. So the press, it seems, could not change their opinion about me. At first it was unpleasant, now I have gotten used to this and treat this rather indifferently. But it is strange when some far-reaching designs are being sought out in simple and natural deeds. This is simply absurd.

There must be a limit to any criticism. Instead, the press has simply declared war on the state. In our current conditions, when everything is so complex and balance in society is hanging by a thread, attacks in the press in every direction are destroying the last vestiges of confidence in people.

[Ariyevich] You said: "I criticize the government in order 'to help' it." But, after all, that is the genuine role of journalists: to be in opposition to authority and thus, by pointing out shortcomings and miscalculations, to help. Why then do you deny the press this?

[Khasbulatov] We must criticize, only not maliciously. We should also sometimes take a look at ourselves: Are we acting properly? After all, it is our parliament and we have no other. And if it is broken up things will only be worse.

[Ariyevich] During your recent working visit to Yakutsk, you encountered very serious problems. People are walking about on top of enormous wealth but are themselves destitute and poor. And as a result, there are plenty of complaints directed at "Big Brother." Do you see these as problems specific to Yakutsk?

[Khasbulatov] The situation is approximately the same in all regions and that, unfortunately, is our common misfortune. And one gets the same complaints and demands in Ryazan and Tambov Oblasts as one does in Udmurtia and Bashkiria. Often people regard separation as guaranteeing that their economic interests are ensured. In my view, it should be a case of some demarcation in the activity of the federal governing bodies and the authorities of the republics, krays, and oblasts. And then the specific local aspects will be taken into account within the framework of overall policy. There is nothing wrong wuth asymmetry here. It is unlikely that value added tax, for instance, should be or can be identical throughout the country at 25-28 percent. It could differ depending on the conditions of the region in question.

I have here a multi-volume code of laws of the Russian Empire. Everything here is clearly demarcated. The rights and obligations of the citizens of Russia, local powers, the local budget, for example, for Karelia. It defines the main provisions by which this or that authority should be guided. Everything is surprisingly logical. This code of laws regulated activities and interrelations on a huge range of issues, and moreover some laws are designed for central authority and others for local authorities. It is what was subsequently totally emasculated in our country over 74 years, when a strong unitary state was being created.

[Ariyevich] The republics are in a hurry and even today they are demanding full independence...

[Khasbulatov] Yes. Take Yakutsk, 92 percent of its economy is strategic industrial potential which doesn't just work for Russia, it is linked with other republics, for example, with Kazakhstan and Ukraine, to no lesser degree than with the Russian economy. It is simply impossible for them to build their own, structurally normal economy by themselves. And so the proud aspirations of Yakutsk politicians are without any real foundation.

[Ariyevich] What awaits us?

[Khasbulatov] If we correct our mistakes while on the move, if we are not stubborn, the reformers' positions will gradually begin to stabilize and gain in strength from the second half of this year.

Stankevich: Unity Must Be Maintained

OW1702214092 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1914 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "Keeping a united Russia, with a territorial, state and spiritual integrity, is assuming particular urgency today, said Sergey Stankevich, Russian Federation's state counselor, in an exclusive interview with IF [INTERFAX]. This challenge of the epoch must be answered immediately, said he.

The breakup of the USSR and the emergence of independent states on the territory of the former Soviet Union is a painful process, but one "that leaves hope for the survival and fairly close coexistence with them," said he.

But Stankevich is harshly critical of the desire of some of the former autonomous republics (i.e. those that are part of Russia proper) to strike out on their own: "Attempts

to make republics within Russia fully independent states call into question the Russian Federation's survival; this is a life-and-death situation."

Therefore, it is essential to formulate the "Russian idea" to address the fundamental questions and provide appraisals of the "pre-Bolshevik and Bolshevik past," and of the Russian Federation's priorities in the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] and the world, said Stankevich. At present, said the state counselor, "of decisive importance is the priority of Russian interests, in comparison with which any political divisions into 'whites', 'reds' and 'greens' pale into insignificance, and any sovereignties big and small are of secondary importance."

Civil Aviation Pilots' Strike Set for 25 Mar

LD1902193692 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] The trade union of Russia's aviation personnel intends to hold a general strike of civil aviation pilots on 25 March. The trade union is putting forward a series of demands, the satisfaction of which will prevent the strike. They include the conclusion of a wage agreement, the inclusion of the pilots' profession in the list of professions with particularly difficult conditions of work, the indexing of pension rates, and the transfer of social insurance to trade union control.

Government Meets With Air Traffic Controllers

LD2002150392 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Ryabov]

[Text] Moscow February 20 TASS—It remains unclear at this hour if Russia's air traffic controllers will strike on Friday [21 February] as scheduled, as the leaders of their trade union are closeted with government representatives, negotiating demands.

According to competent sources, the government is represented by Russian Labour and Employment Minister Aleksandr Shokhin, Transport Minister Vitaliy Efimov and chief of the air traffic department Aleksandr Larin.

The air traffic controllers are represented by Sergey Yevsyukov, president of the federation of trade unions of russian air traffic controllers.

More than 30 Russian airports are ready to strike, according to sources at the federation headquarters. The main centre of the country's single air traffic control system and the airport of the city of Kirov have refused to participate.

Minister Cites Demands

PM2002141692 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Viktor Belikov: "Air Traffic Controllers' Strike Threat Not Lifted"]

[Text] There are two days left before the beginning of the strike by Russian air traffic controllers, declared for 21 February. The situation, which is growing more acute with every passing hour, was discussed 18 February at a conference in the air transport department.

Moscow's air terminal is located just a stone's throw away from the building where civil aviation service leaders met with representatives of the Federation of Air Traffic Controllers' Trade Unions. Nowadays the normally crowded square in front of it is deserted as never before: The volume of air shipments has fallen by one-quarter. Moreover, there is a very real prospect of being stranded for a long time at an airport far from home if the "conductors" of the airways strike at the end of the week. V. Yefimov, Russian minister of transport, and A. Larin, director of the ministry's air transport department, held a meeting with the strike initiators, which lasted several hours.

The two main demands prompted the Russian transport minister to state his position thoroughly. Above all, the issue centers on the creation of a state interdepartmental commission—"Rosaeronavigatsiya"—conceived as the sole master of services controlling air traffic above Russia. Air traffic controllers believe that "Rosaeronavigatsiya" should be set up under the head of the Russian Government—a lower status would not be fitting. Minister V. Yefimov, referring to the continued lack of an Air Code for Russia and the lamentable inertia of the USSR Gosaeronavigatsiya [State Commission for the Utilization of Airspace and Air Traffic Control], which existed for two years ("it turned out that nobody needed it"), suggested forming a commission under the transport minister in the first instance. Its rank could be raised at some point in the future.

The air traffic controllers' second demand—that the recently founded Interstate Aviation Committee (IAC) not be charged with the functions of utilization of air space and traffic control—was prompted by earlier reports on the committee's sphere of activity. IAC Chairman T. Anodina has now issued an official statement, which our newspaper also received, saying that the committee is not assuming such authoritative functions and acts merely as a coordinating organ.

Nevertheless, the sides had come to no agreement by midday 19 February.

Foreign Intelligence Official on Activities

LD1902193892 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1520 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] Today a briefing was given at the press center of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs by Tatyana

Samolets, press secretary of the director of the Russian foreign intelligence service. What has the Foreign Intelligence Service been doing in recent months?

[Begin Samolets recording] First, there have been parliamentary hearings on the activity of the law-enforcement bodies in connection with the attempted coup d'etat in August. Let me recall the speech at the hearings by Lisov, deputy prosecutor general, and Stepashin, chairman of the parliamentary commission. It transpires from these speeches that intelligence did not play a direct part in the August putsch. Primakov, director of the Foreign Intelligence Service, also spoke at these hearings. He said that a retrospective look at the activity of the intelligence service naturally reveals not just its best sides—and much could of course be said about this, because much has been done to protect the interests of the state—but also negative aspects. The negative sides can, of course, primarily be explained by the ideological involvement of the service, in connection with which Yevgeniy Maksimovich made three requests to parliament. First, the earliest adoption of a law on the intelligence service. The second request was that a special parliamentary commission on intelligence be set up that would be quite separate from the other commissions, particularly from the commission on security and others. He also asked that on the basis of the future law on the intelligence service, a number of people should be chosen from the future commission who would take an oath, who would enjoy special trust and respect among parliamentarians, and would give a written undertaking not to reveal state secrets—they would take an oath, as I said—and would have access to intelligence material.

The second point we consider to be significant this month was a visit to the headquarters of the Foreign Intelligence Service by Procurator General Stepankov, his deputy Lisov and investigating team chief Aristov. In the course of their detailed conversation with intelligence chiefs, they discussed matters linked with the probe into the CPSU money. Procuracy officials will be provided with all the acts in the possession of the intelligence service in this case. A special commission has been set up to give every assistance to the investigating team.

For my part, I would like to say a little more on this. For intelligence employees, such a thing as the transfer of money was completely unprofitable and burdensome. As I see it, the people who work there are fairly bright, and they realize that it is a tricky matter. It was probably not a problem for the majority of them. But apart from that it was simply dangerous. So, after the repeal of Article 6 of the Constitution [on the leading role of the party] they even quietly tried to do away with it themselves, eliminating it altogether by the end of 1990. Another point which I am gradually working out for myself is that far from everything that journalists want from the intelligence service, in the belief that it is to be found in its archives, in fact exists. It is not because of someone's deception, but because it really does not exist. It seems to me that the party issued all its most delicate requests without leaving any traces, and very often without any documentary evidence. [end recording]

Further on Briefing

LD1902223492 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow February 19 TASS—Russia is developing a law on intelligence to determine duties and rights of intelligence agents, Tatyana Samolets, spokesperson for the Russian foreign intelligence director, said.

She said the law will use the experience of other countries. It will also oblige all intelligence service agents and employees to submit for censorship all information intended for publication, including anything written after their retirement.

Russian Prosecutor General Valentin Stepankov and his deputy Yevgeniy Lisov visited the intelligence headquarters in February to discuss the pace of investigation concerning the Soviet Communist Party funds abroad.

Samolis said the intelligence service is also controlling the spread of weapons of mass destruction in the republic, including nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, as well as military know-how, which may pose a real threat to international stability.

She mentioned the service intends to cooperate with other Commonwealth states, including granting them access to its data-base.

Security Organizations Accorded Special Rights

LD1902233892 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Report by V. Martynov from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] In accordance with the draft law, internal affairs bodies, the Ministry of Security, and sub-units of the border troops and the chief security guard directorate [glavnoye upravleniye ohkrany] have received the right, while conducting operational activities, to carry out secret shadowing of people and secret inspection of premises and cars, with the exception of residential premises, to open and inspect mail, to eavesdrop on telephone calls, to obtain information from technical communication channels, and so on and so forth. A sanction by a procurator is necessary for the special services to intrude into a person's private life and everyone has the right now to receive information on whether operational checking has been conducted on him and what its results were.

In many respects the law gives rise to a negative reaction by free individuals; the point is, however, that before all this activity was conducted to no lesser extent but exclusively on the basis of secret internal departmental instructions.

[Begin recording] [B. Kondrashov, member of the Russian Supreme Soviet, identified by caption] The worst thing is that there had been practically no supervision over these bodies, either procuracy or judicial. For the first time we are introducing strict procuracy, and parliamentary control. [end recording]

Further on Democratic Reform Movement Congress

PM1902161592 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 17 Feb 92 First Edition p 1

[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA correspondent report under the rubric "Congresses": "Nizhniy Novgorod Patrons"]

[Text] Nizhniy Novgorod—Two events have been going on at the same time during the past two days on the territory of the Nizhniy Novgorod kremlin—The Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms and the Russian National Assembly Founding Congresses. They had one aim—to find ways of saving the country, but here the similarity ended. The "brothers and sisters" did not admit staffers of democratic publications into the hall. All that has become known is that nationality was successfully moved from fifth to second place in the participants' questionnaire and that General Sterligov, a relative of our famous entrepreneur and, if we are to believe the experts, a patron of the Slavic Assembly, spoke to those assembled for one and a half hours. ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA has in its possession a record of the speech of the "thoroughly Russian" general.

But in the neighboring building where the other founding congress was taking place, G. Popov looked lonely in the presidium without his usual associates from the Movement for Democratic Reforms—Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Volskiy, Shatalin, Sobchak, and Rutskoy. "What is needed," he stated, "is an administrative system of a special transitional type in order to dismantle the state economy and make the transition to the market." "Either you create a command system or you will not keep social development within normal bounds. This is the bitter truth—but the truth it is just the same." "Our slogan is: complete reform of the mechanism of executive power." The attitude of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms to power is that representative organs' functions should be clearly restricted to lawmaking alone, and that they should be kept resolutely away from executive functions. Not all power to the soviets, just representative power. Therefore the first slogan of the Russian for Movement Democratic Reforms is: new elections to all representative organs of power from top to bottom in the shortest possible time.

Republican Party leader Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, who was present, left the conference hall having rebuked the mayor of Moscow for usurping the Russian Movement for Democratic Reform's power and announced that his party's membership of the movement would be suspended. Members of the People's Party of Free Russia (accounting for at least 20 percent of the delegates), stated after consultation that they are not suspending their membership of the Democratic Reform Movement but the question will be put at the next session of the Central Committee of the People's Party of Free Russia.

It seems that this was no surprise to Gavriil Kharitonovich but merely the logical conclusion to his activity to form his own party which have been going on for more than a year. G. Popov was elected chairman of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms unanimously.

And so the Movement for Democratic Reforms has ceased to exist as an international organization. And by the way as a movement in general. You see you can hardly talk about a coalition of various parties now. Their democratic leaders do not favor one-man leadership...

Considered 'Constructive Opposition'

LD2002104592 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0800 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Text] The Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms, inaugurated at a congress in Nizhniy Novgorod on 15 February, is in constructive opposition to the present government. This was stated at a news conference in Moscow on the evening of 19 February by the movement's leaders. Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov, who was elected the movement's chairman at the congress in Nizhniy Novgorod, stressed that the movement seeks to become a reserve democratic front. ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, commenting today on the results of the congress in Nizhniy Novgorod, believes that Gavriil Popov's dream to create a new type of party has come true.

Popov Cited on Goals

OW2002125592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1105 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms has filled the vacuum that appeared in the political structure of Russian society after the abortive coup. The statement was made at a Wednesday [19 February] news conference by Gavriil Popov who was recently elected the chairman of the movement.

He said that the new situation in Russia required a regrouping of political forces and the appearance of a party that could rely on entrepreneurs as the main force capable of saving the country. The Mayor of Petersburg and a leading member of the movement Anatoliy Sobchak warned the news conference of the grave threat to Russia, because "radical economic reforms are conducted in conditions of a severe crisis and in the absence of appropriate legislation". He stressed that the absence of the constitution aggravates the situation. In his opinion the main task of the movement is to promote the adoption of a truly democratic constitution.

He said that the movement agrees with the aims of the Yeltsin government but reserves the right to criticize it constructively.

Communist Workers Party Opposes CPSU Revival

MK1802121592 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Feb 92 p 2

[Yuliy Lebedev report: "Communists: Communists Do Not Want To Revive CPSU. Now At Any Rate"]

[Text] A number of Bolshevik leaders still have hopes of reviving the CPSU. A conference of various communist parties and movements was held 15-16 February in the city of Zheleznodorozhnyy near Moscow on the initiative of the Committee for Communist Unity.

The meeting's organizers intended its participants to proclaim themselves the 20th All-Union Party Conference. It was also intended that an extraordinary CPSU Central Committee be elected here and the 29th CPSU Congress scheduled (presumably in May). It was intended that all the communist parties present should join the revived CPSU as platforms.

However, right after the conference began it became clear that by no means all communists want to revive the former CPSU, much less does anyone want to recognize the Committee for Communist Unity as the coordinating organ in this work.

Leaders of the Russian Communist Workers Party [RCWP] opposed the restoration of the CPSU most vigorously. This party is now the largest and most prestigious within the communist movement, so it is not surprising that its leaders consider themselves the repositories of the best Bolshevik traditions and do not see the need for another Communist Party.

"On the train en route from Moscow to Zheleznodorozhnyy some of the activists behind this conference compiled lists of the future 'CPSU Central Committee,' naturally without forgetting themselves in the process," NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent was told by Oleg Cherkovets, a member of the RCWP, who took part in the meeting.

RCWP leaders read out a special statement calling the meeting's organizers impostors and their actions irresponsible and adventurist—after which they left the room.

The next day, although only half of the participants attended the meeting (65 people) it was proclaimed an all-Union party conference (admittedly, without a number).

There was another "communist walkout" after this. Representatives of the League of Communists [Soyuz Kommunistov], the Bolshevik Platform, and the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Moscow City Committee left the conference. NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent was told by Aleksey Prigarin, leader of the League of Communists, that he is in favor of reviving the CPSU, however he thinks that this should happen gradually. A special statement approved by these movements set up a committee to promote the convocation of the 29th CPSU Congress. The same document demands that CPSU Central Committee members hold a plenum before the congress to disband the Politburo and Secretariat and decide to expel from the CPSU communist leaders who have compromised themselves.

Nevertheless the meeting decided by 35 votes to set up an All-Union CPSU Coordinating Committee, which is to convene the 29th party congress forthwith.

"Of course this 29th congress may go ahead," Aleksandr Prigarin said, "but, in effect, a new and obviously extremely small communist party would then form under the CPSU banner."

Russian Communist Party Policy Summarized

LD1902192392 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow February 19 TASS—Vladimir Khazanov, member of the Central Executive Committee of the Russian Communist Party, told ITAR-TASS that as the party is in the centre of the left spectrum of the Russian political forces, it has undertaken a difficult task of creating a bloc of the left forces.

The Russian Communist Party, one of at least nine parties claiming to be successors to the CPSU, was formed at the founding conference in December 1991 and is awaiting official registration with the Russian Ministry of Justice. It is one of the three parties formed on the basis of the "Marxist platform" that existed in the CPSU. Of the other two parties, the Communist Alliance led by Alexey Prigarin is to the left of the Russian Communist Party, while the Labour Party headed by Aleksandr Buzgalin is to the right of the party. Khazanov believes that one party with three platforms can be formed later of these three parties.

"We have much in common with these parties, but our party's substantial distinction from the Communist Alliance is that we believe socialism has not been built in our country", Khazanov said. "We regard Stalinism as vicious anticommunism, and we think that we cannot form an alliance with left extremist parties, such as Nina Andreyeva's All-Union Bolshevik Communist Party or with the Russian Communist Workers' Party".

Among foreign parties, the Russian Communist Party feels closest of all to the French Communist Party.

Leaders of the Russian Communist Party think that the CPSU ceased to become relevant and that, contrary to plans of a number of communist groups which declare for the convocation of the 29th CPSU Congress, it

cannot be restored. "It split into at least nine parties, and this is normal. Blocs of parties, but not a single party, can form on its basis", Khazanov said.

Regarding the socio-economic programme of the Russian Communist Party, Khazanov said that the party is against the freeing of prices and believes that the main production assets should be turned over to work collectives. "We are not against honest enterprise, but we are against the country being sold out to foreign capital," he said.

"We demand the resignation of the Yeltsin government. We believe that it should be replaced with a popular unity government of representatives of the left bloc, non-party people and, possibly, some people who were earlier in the Democratic Russia Movement", Khazanov said. He believes economist Tatyana Karyagina could head such a cabinet.

Khazanov thinks that the courting of national patriots by leaders, specifically the vice president, is a dangerous tendency. "We are concerned with the present tendencies in the patriotic movement. It is obviously shifting to the right", he said.

Anti-Zionist Nationalists Attend Congress

LD1702210592 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 17 Feb 92

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The constituent congress of what is called the Russian National Assembly [Russkiy Natsionalnyy Sobor], a nationalist organization which regards the fight against world Zionism as one of its main tasks, has been held in Nizhniy Novgorod. The RIA Agency reports that the congress heard statements to the effect that all military and patriotic organizations secretly regard Aleksandr Rutskoy as their leader. According to Aleksandr Denisov, head of the operational detachment [operativnyy otryad] of Cossacks of Southern Russia, world Zionism is in charge of the actions of the present Russian Government.

New 'Workers Party' Profiled

MK1802122792 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Feb 92 p 2

[Anna Ostapchuk report under "There Is Such a Party" rubric: "'Factories and Plants For the Workers!' That Is What Their New Party Promises Them"]

[Text] Another party has been formed claiming to defend the rights of workers—namely the Workers Party [rabochaya partiya] [WP]. This happened 15 February at the "Zavod Mikhelsona" named for Ilich Palace of Culture. Some 72 delegates from a dozen or more of Russia's regions were present. Far larger numbers were expected, but the increased cost of the tickets prevented this. In the organizers' opinion, the WP will shortly have the number of members needed for registration—500.

"Politically related" guests—from the Socialist Party of Working People, the Labor Party, the Workers Party (their namesakes), and the Russian Communist Workers Party—were present.

Last June's congress of Moscow workers stated the need to set up the WP. It was then decided to wait a while: It is, after all, the CPSU's legal prerogative to defend the workers, and it was not known how this competition would look. The number of left-wing parties has now risen to an inordinate level, and they are all more or less operating on an equal footing. However, whereas they are all unreservedly proclaiming the advantages of socialism or want to defend the workers in conditions of capitalism, the WP advocates a "third path" for Russia's development—not capitalism and not socialism. This system should be based on self-management for labor collectives. Russian parliamentarian Vladimir Tikhonov, one of the leaders of the WP, has formulated a program for switching to this system. According to his concept, property must remain owned by all the people [obshchenarodnyy], but be transferred to the possession of the workers. These ideas are quite close to the Union of Labor Collectives [soyuz trudovykh kollektivov], but the WP believes that the Union of Labor Collectives has become dependent on official structures and is pursuing a policy of appeasement.

The organizers of the WP consider themselves centrists. They do not expect a rapid increase in their ranks in the near future. The constituent conference adopted statutes and a program statement and formed a Russian organizational committee and the party's Moscow regional organization headed by Konstantin Nikolayev.

The WP organizational committee thinks that they will shortly be joined by some relatively developed related structures. These being mainly disillusioned democrats: The "Free Urals" movement and the Volgograd democratic movement are considering the possibility of actively cooperating with the WP in the workers faction of "Democratic Russia," whose coordinator Seregina attended the conference.

The WP is also willing to cooperate with the trade unions, although it thinks that if the party's aims are achieved there will be no need for trade unions—they only defend hired workers, after all.

The WP will join in the communist rally 23 February—not as a sign of unity, but out of respect for a great holiday: The Army's integrity is, after all, the country's integrity.

INTERFAX Corrects 'Inaccurate Report' on Gold

OW1902185392

[Editorial Report] Moscow INTERFAX in English at 1640 GMT on 19 February supplies the following service

message correcting the item headlined "Resolution Calls for Selling Gold Abroad" published in the 19 February Central Eurasia DAILY REPORT, page 54. The service message is slugged "ATTENTION SUBSCRIBERS" and reads as follows:

"We apologize for the inaccurate report in the 12:30 bulletin for today (February 19) titled 'Russian Gold To Be Sold Abroad'. Here is the correct information:

"Russian Vice-Premier Yegor Gaydar has signed a directive on the sale of some of the gold mined in Russia in 1991. Part of the revenue from the sales are to be spent to meet some of the needs of the Sakha (Yakutiyan) Republic, one of Russia's principal gold-mining areas. Recently the living standards of Yakutiya's population have drastically gone down.

"The directive leaves the price at which the state buys gold from miners unchanged for the next six months. Experts believe, however, that during the second half of this year Russia will nevertheless be able to sell its gold at what will very nearly be the world price, about $11-12 per gram."

Supreme Soviet

Proceedings of 19 Feb Session Reviewed

LD1902211892

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1800 GMT on 19 February carries its "At the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Session" program of recorded highlights of proceedings at the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet session held in Moscow on 19 February.

The program opens with Ryzhov, chairman of the subcommittee for science and education, proposing a vote on a law on trade marks. The voting takes place and the law is adopted.

Ryzhov then proposes that a vote be taken on a law protecting computer programs. The voting takes place and the law is adopted.

At 1804 GMT, deputy Lakhova puts forward a draft decision on payment for child-care establishments. Questions to Lakhova follow. Voting takes place and the draft decision is adopted.

At 1813 GMT the camera shows the start of a joint session of the chambers. Polenov, chairman of the commission for culture, presents a report on the Lenin Library and the issue of returning cultural values to the people. He then reads a telegram to Yeltsin from the International Association of Libraries protesting the procedure for abolishing the Lenin Library.

Polenov is followed by Mukhamadiyev, chairman of the commission for cultural heritage. He gives some background details to the Shneyerson collection, which is currently claimed by the Hasidic community in Moscow. The commission's view is to keep the collection in the library.

At 1821 GMT, Culture Minister Sidorov takes the floor. The status of the library should be determined urgently. The Shneyerson problem should be solved on a legal basis with reference to international practice. The collection should be opened to the public as soon as possible. There is a question of legality of returning state property to former owners.

Procurator Stepankov gives clarifications regarding the Shneyerson affair. Shokhin's instruction is incorrect and should be repealed.

At 1826 GMT a government representative takes the floor to speak about the implementation of a decision on cultural heritage.

Igumnova, deputy director of Lenin Library, then takes the floor to speak about the inadmissibility of dividing up the library.

At 1830 GMT voting on the decision on cultural heritage takes place, and the decision is adopted. At this point the program ends.

Deputy Chairman Filatov Heads 17 Feb Presidium

PM2002102392 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Feb 92 First Edition p 1

[Russian Supreme Soviet Press Center report: "At the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] A session of the Presidium of the Russian parliament under the chairmanship of S. Filatov, Supreme Soviet first deputy chairman, was held 17 February.

A working group was established to deal with practical questions pertaining to the preparation of the Sixth Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies. The draft law "On National Autonomies in the Russian Federation" was presented. It provides for the introduction of a uniform territorial description—"national autonomy"—for autonomous oblasts and okrugs which are defined as national-territorial entities within the Russian Federation. The draft law has been sent to parliamentary committees and commissions for examination.

As part of the control procedure the decision of the Tomsk Oblast Soviet dated 17 January 1992 "On the Draft Provision for Destatization and Privatization of Property Administered by Tomsk Oblast Soviets of People's Deputies" was examined. Declaring the said decision at variance with the Russian Federation's legislation, the Presidium instructed the Tomsk Oblast Soviet to annul it.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium backed the initiative of the Omsk Oblast Soviet of

People's Deputies to establish an Azovskiy German National Rayon on the territory of Omsk Oblast.

Other questions pertaining to the republic's state affairs were also discussed at the session.

German District in Omsk Region Endorsed

LD1802015692 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 2035 GMT 17 Feb 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Omsk—On February 17 presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation endorsed a decree on establishing the Azovskiy German National District in the Omsk region. The request to establish the Azovskiy German National District in the Omsk region was submitted to presidium of the Supreme Soviet on February 13 by the Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

On October 13, 1991 a poll on the establishing of a German national district was held in several villages in the Omsk region. 8,678 people took part in the voting, 82.7 per cent supported the idea of establishing a national district. According to the president's representative at the February 17 hearing, deputy prime- minister, Russian federal legal counselor Sergey Shakhray, 65 per cent of local residents in this area are ethnic Germans. The number of German population in the region totals 134 thousand. The Omsk regional council backed the decision on establishing the Azovskiy German National District and applied with this request to president of the Russian Federation.

Further Shaposhnikov Comments on Coup Attempt

LD1802234492 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 18 Feb 92

[From the "Vesti" Newscast]

[Text] Today, the commission of the Russian Supreme Soviet Presidium investigating the reasons for and circumstances of the coup d'etat is holding open parliamentary hearings, or rather has already conducted them today, on the role of the commanders of the USSR Armed Forces in the preparations for and conduct of the coup in August 1991.

[Unidentified speaker] The participation of the Army in the attempted coup was in the main determined by the participation in the conspiracy of its supreme commanders.

[Correspondent A. Peslyak] The investigator covered in detail the preparatory stage of the putsch; the meeting on 5 August, with the participation of Yazov, when it was decided to introduce a state of emergency before 20 August by any means. In the military dossier 10 blocks of documents have been singled out: the evaluation of the activity and movement of troops, their participation in the storming of the White House, the seizing of people's deputies, of the president of Russia, as well as the role the general staff, of the airborne assault troops, and of the anti-aircraft defense.

For 73 hours the USSR president was deprived of the possibility of supervising Technical Complex No. 1, that is the country's strategic forces. And during that period places were prepared for the detainees in the settlement of Medvezhiye Ozero, on the orders of Marshal Yazov,

[Begin recording of Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the Commonwealth of Independent States Armed Forces] But he did not make up his mind to use the Army against the people. [end recording]

[Peslyak] In the view of the investigation, Grachev and Gromov prevented the storming of the White House by troops. And more than 300 high-ranking officers, who actively supported the State Committee for the State of Emergency, have been sacked. But it was only in the auditorium together with everyone, that Major Yevdokimov learned that he has been Lieutenant Colonel for 10 days now and will occupy the relevant post.

What is going to happen to the Army now?

[Begin Shaposhnikov recording] There is such a disgraceful state of affairs in the Army, especially in Azerbaijan, the troops are in an extremely tragic state there. [end recording]

[Peslyak] But the main thing is that there are no laws regulating the life of the military. Unfortunately, a law-based evaluation was largely replaced by the squabbles and ambitions of a number of deputies.

[Begin recording of V. Urazhtsev, people's deputy of Russia] Today the Army is just as dangerous for the people as it was before the State Committee for the State of Emergency. [end recording]

Bill on Security Slated for Discussion

OW1902180692 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1640 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] IF [INTERFAX] learned that Thursday [20 February] the Russian parliament is scheduled to discuss a draft law on security prepared by order of the congress of people's deputies.

Vladimir Vorontsov, one of the experts who took part in preparation of the draft law told IF that will serve as the basis for draft laws on various spheres of security—state, ecological, military, etc.

Vorontsov said that under the draft law, the president and vice-president will enjoy permanent membership in the Security Council being created in Russia.

Chambers Hold Joint Session 14 Feb

LD1402122192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Report by Correspondent V. Tsygankov; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The Russian Supreme Soviet is holding a joint session of chambers today.

[Tsygankov] A certain friction between the executive and legislative powers was evident again today when the Russian parliament began discussing additional questions to be included in the agenda of the session. Many actions of the Mossovet and even of the government of the republic, the deputies are saying, run counter to the decisions and laws the Supreme Soviet is adopting. Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov noted that the instructions and requests of the Supreme Soviet which are given to the government simply are not being examined and are being ignored. It was decided to discuss all these questions again, together with members of the government, at the next plenary session.

Then the parliament moved on to the examination of a draft law on introducing changes and additions to the Russian Federation law on payment for land. As is known, at a second reading today it was preceded by long, stormy, and pointed discussion.

Today the parliament is discussing amendments to this document which have been proposed by the Conciliation Commission.

Sixth Congress Agenda Discussed

LD1402200692

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 1130 GMT on 14 February broadcasts an 8-minute report by correspondent Andrey Nikiferov on today's proceedings at the Russian Supreme Soviet.

The report begins with the correspondent noting that "A keen debate developed about the issue of the agenda of the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies of Russia which, it has been decided, will open on 6 April in Moscow. In particular, the debate is about whether the draft of Russia's new constitution should be included. A number of deputies proposed that speakers should restrict themselves to submitting amendments and addendums to the Constitution now in force, arguing that in the complicated transitional period a new Constitution should not be adopted—this is dangerous—that as before it has not been fully worked out, in particular its key chapter about the state structure of Russia."

Nikiferov then goes on to interview Russian People's Deputy Oleg Rumyantsev, secretary of the Constitution Commission, who explains what the actual state of affairs is in this respect. He also cites the results of a sociological poll carried out throughout Russia by the Supreme Soviet's subcommittee for the study of public opinion about whether the Federation should be based on the Constitution, on the basis of a Treaty, or be a Confederation.

Nikiferov then turns to the subject of the ratification of the Treaty on the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS]. He says:

"I will add a few more words about a very acute issue which was raised today at the session. A number of deputies—Konstantinov, Aksyuchits, Pavlov, Isakov, Baburin—decided to include, or to request the inclusion, for the Congress to consider the question of the ratification of the CIS Treaty, to more precise, of the constitutionality of this Treaty. Deputy Isakov was even more frank: He said that it would be a mistake to ratify the disintegration of the Union. And Deputy Astafyev said that on the whole the Union had not all disintegrated, simply that a USSR president is lacking, and his role is temporarily being fulfilled by James Baker, who is in the CIS."

Congress Agenda Detailed

LD1802211192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1950 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow, 18 February. (ITAR-TASS)—The following is the text of a decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation on the convocation of the sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the republic:

The Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation decrees:

I. To convene the sixth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation on 6 April 1992 in Moscow.

II. To propose the inclusion of the following questions on the agenda of the Congress of People's Deputies:

1. On the recognition of the powers of people's deputies of the Russian Federation who were elected after the fifth [extraordinary] Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation.

2. On the progress of the economic reform in the Russian Federation.

3. On the Constitution of the Russian Federation.

4. On the socioeconomic situation of the northern regions and of localities on the same footing.

5. The election of members of the Soviet of the Republic and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

6. The election of judges of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation.

7. The endorsement of the chairman of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation.

8. The endorsement of the chairman of the Supreme Court of Arbitration of the Russian Federation.

9. On the political situation in the Russian Federation and the Commonwealth of Independent States: The state of and prospects for development.

10. On the execution of decisions adopted by the Congresses of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

'Quiet' Putsch Fails

PM1902160192 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Feb 92 First Edition p 1

[Parliamentary observer Robert Minasov "Viewpoint": "Seeds of Intrigues Also Sprout"]

[Text] At the 14 February joint session of the chambers of the Russian Supreme Soviet, during a discussion of the agenda for the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies, Vladimir Kuznetsov, member of parliament, declared the following: "It is already obvious that we (read—the president and the government which he heads—R.M.) have messed up the reform... Therefore I propose including on the Congress agenda the question **of terminating the president's powers.**" There was a rumble of indignation in the hall. The penny suddenly dropped for the deputy: "I meant additional powers."

However, there is a definite concealed meaning in that slip of the tongue: This is a logical consequence of the purposeful attack which the right wing of the parliamentary corps has mounted recently within the walls of parliament against the president and against the government's economic reform.

But let us return to Kuznetsov's proposal. What arguments did the deputy possess when he spoke so categorically of the reform's obvious failure? It is difficult today to sing the government's praises, but neither will I dish out abuse so lightly. It has taken quite a few rash and ill-considered steps in the course of realizing a radical economic reform. However, many people are reassured by the fact that so far not a single really authoritative scientist—economist, expert, political scientist, or analyst—has been so bold as to make an unambiguous assessment: The time is not ripe, let the government work a bit...

Kuznetsov found consistent allies in the persons of Vyacheslav Lyubimov, Dmitriy Stepanov, Sergey Baburin, and Nikolay Pavlov. They demanded the same thing on that day, speaking from all five microphones in the hall. There was an ulterior motive behind their great fondness for the attempt to impose on parliament 7 February a package of unconstitutional legislative acts essentially designed to deprive the president not only of his emergency powers but also of all other, constitutional powers, allocating to him the role of the British queen, who, as is known, reigns but does not rule. Fortunately, the "quiet" parliamentary putsch failed.

What goal is being sought by the section of parliament that is opposed to the president and the present executive power? The answer is obvious: the extreme fueling of a mass psychosis around the political and economic difficulties, so as to ensure that the structures themselves collapse under pressure from protest actions by people duped by jingoistic propaganda shows.

On that same day Nikolay Pavlov, a fervent advocate of preserving the USSR within its former borders at any price and a loyal "armor bearer" of Sergey Baburin, had introduced considerable confusion into the souls of parliamentarians and journalists with his orthodox and shocking proposal to discuss "the question of the CIS" [Commonwealth of Independent States] at the Congress.

Ruslan Khasbulatov asked him to elaborate on the wording. But he stuck to his guns.

Pavlov threatened that he would be prepared to spend even half an hour at the upcoming Congress demonstrating the unconstitutional nature of the formation of the CIS. Let us assume that Pavlov will succeed in arguing for this, since the godfathers of the CIS failed to avoid partisan methods in the process of creating it. But is it possible to reverse the process? To make Ukraine, Belarus, and other republics return to the bosom of the "indissoluble Union," beneath the scarlet banners with the hammer and sickle?

Alas, Nikolay Pavlov was not alone. Viktor Aksyuchits, Sergey Baburin, Vladimir Isakov, and Dmitriy Stepanov developed variations on this dangerously explosive theme. However, they condescended to a demand to discuss just the ratification of the Agreement on the CIS.

Khasbulatov tried stoically to make people understand: This is unconstitutional, for ratification is the prerogative of the Supreme Soviet, not the Congress. The Supreme Soviet ratified the agreement long ago. Let him who has ears hear. But no, Vladimir Isakov does not want to hear, extracting from the Congress standing orders the point to the effect that the Congress can examine any questions... This too is an argument. But the ratification has taken place... Khasbulatov put Pavlov's proposal to the vote the way he had worded it: on the CIS. Just 60 deputies voted in favor. However, you could put it another way—regrettably, 60!

Right-wingers are making careful preparations to do battle with the president and his comrades in arms at the sixth Congress in the hope of taking revenge for their crushing defeat at that other Congress, when they tried to bring down Boris Yeltsin, who was still Supreme Soviet chairman at the time.

This is also evidenced by their insistent desire to bring forward the opening day of the Sixth Congress. They got their way: Yielding to pressure from the same old people, parliament set the opening date—6 April.

Deputy Address on Border Accord With PRC

LD1602104592 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1805 GMT 13 Feb 92

[Remarks by Vladimir Petrovich Lukin, chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, at 13 February session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow on the border agreement with China, including interspersed remarks by unidentified deputy and Deputy Selivanov, a border guard from constituency No. 512 on the River Amur border with China, and results of voting announced by Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet; from the "At the Russian Supreme Soviet session"—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed deputies, first of all I would like to say that the question which we are now discussing was given extremely close attention at a meeting of the Committee on International Affairs. After a very energetic debate, which touched on all the questions which we are now discussing, the Committee unanimously decided that it should support the ratification of this treaty. I stress the word unanimously because unanimity is something which has become rather a rarity in our experience of the last few years. It recommended, as the Supreme Soviet's Presidium has done, that this question should be tabled before you and that the treaty should be ratified by the Supreme Soviet.

What were we, all the members of the Committee on International Affairs, guided by when we made this decision? Yes, it is of course unpleasant when a certain number of small islands end up on the neighbor's side, no matter how friendly and respected that neighbor might be, rather than our own side as a result of a settlement, unpleasant when we cannot hang on to all of them. But I think there are now few who would dispute that Russia, as it is now developing, has three [as heard] great immediate neighbors. These include our neighbors in the West—new neighbors, and very old ones at the same time. These also include Japan and the United States, and of course they also include—first and foremost perhaps—China.

Our relations with China have had their ups and downs, as you know. We have come to the brink of war in the past. We have also had very friendly, ideologized relations. Now our task is to build these relations in the way they should be—not too dependent on internal problems and internal changes, both in our country and in China. In other words they should be based on the clear foundation of international law and international agreements, and on existing international principles. In current conditions we have to demonstrate to the entire world and to our neighbors that we consistently advocate the principles of international law and not just when it benefits us in a one-sided way.

At the same time I am profoundly convinced that the demarcation of the border between us and China is exceptionally beneficial to us. I would like to say that the emergence of territorial problems with China would create an extremely complex strategic situation when we already have territorial problems with Japan, and very complex relations, on a whole range of matters, with our independent neighbors who belong to the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS].

I think it is only very rash people who would want to intensify this tendency and exacerbate it. Therefore, from a strategic point of view, from a conceptual point of view, and from the point of view of our long-term state interests, the conclusion of a treaty with China which closes all the main questions with that country—and without harming our own very important interests of course—is exceptionally important and beneficial to us. I am inclined to agree with our Foreign Ministry colleagues that the agreement does not alter state borders. The principles underlying those treaties which were concluded a very long time ago were completely different. The de facto ownership of the islands was established in 1930 by our own unilateral action. They were never the subject of an agreement.

For all these reasons, both large strategic ones and very specific ones relating to international law, this agreement must be ratified. I actively call on our esteemed colleagues to ratify this agreement and to instruct the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to keep us informed of the progress of talks on those two points, which really are of serious interest to us, and on which we should combine flexibility with a very serious defense of our own national interests.

[Unidentified deputy] Esteemed People's Deputies, I shall vote with both hands for the ratification of this document. Why? Because having lived for 20 years by the border which we are discussing, we know perfectly well how difficult the lack of a settlement on the border question makes it for our border guards and other departments to settle questions with the Chinese side. It makes life particularly difficult for residents living on our side of the border. Therefore, I consider that the sooner this document is ratified in full, the better.

[Selivanov, in border guard's uniform] Selivanov from territorial constituency No. 512. I would like to tell you what I think of the document as a whole, since I have served on the River Amur which runs along the border, and in Blagoveshchensk and Khabarovsk. I have gone out on combat duty along a 500-km section of the Chinese border. Let me tell you what I think of those suggestions that Chinese launches or warships will pass below the windows of my own home. Let me say a few words to the deputies who think this way. Our warships, our launches—armored launches—have patrolled alongside settlements and villages on the Chinese side and continue to do so. They patrol under the windows of those peaceful homes. Generally speaking, nothing extraordinary happens there because, given the conditions of this border on the border River Amur, this simply cannot be prevented. Therefore, I propose that a positive decision be made, in principle, on this question. Thank you.

[Khasbulatov] I ask the deputies to vote on the motion. I ask you to vote on the ratification of the agreement. It is passed. [Video shows figures on electronic scoreboard: 174 in favor, 2 against, with 24 abstentions]

Deputy Outlines Introduction of Bank Checks

LD1602142792 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1812 GMT 13 Feb 92

[Remarks by Deputy Aleksandr Petrovich Pochinok at the Russian Supreme Soviet held on 13 February in Moscow on introduction of payments by bank checks; from the "At the Russian Supreme Soviet session' program—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies. Draft regulations on checks are being tabled for your attention. What is the background to these regulations? On 13 January the Supreme Soviet Presidium , which, in this difficult situation, constantly monitors the circulation of money in the country, decided that checks, payment checks, would be introduced into circulation in Russia on 20 January. This is what they look like. [Video shows Pochinok holding up an outsize sample of check for deputies to inspect]

Take a look at it, please. Why have these checks been issued? The idea is very simple. The idea is very simple. At the moment we need ready cash in order to carry out many operations. Our objective is to reduce the amount of ready cash in circulation. Up to now emission—the issue of money—has on its own accounted for one-sixth of all payments in Russia. In December it was actually a quarter—just from emission. Any transactions involving ready cash create extra problems for us. The printing presses are already overheating. They just cannot cope with such quantities. The rest of the world has become accustomed to settling accounts with checks. This dispenses with the need for ready cash. A check is made out for any amount, provided the funds are available in the account.

But there must be clearcut regulations for check payments. In our country such regulations were adopted in 1929, 62 years ago. They are obsolete. These regulations must be replaced. To be honest with you, this is really a banking matter. It is the bank's problem. But since the bank is accountable to the Supreme Soviet, and since we have taken over all questions of monetary control, policy on monetary control and credit, financial policy, and so on, into our own jurisdiction through our own legislation, we have to endorse these regulations on checks.

They have absolutely no ideological or political content. They merely explain the technical mechanism for settling accounts with checks—who pays and how, how transactions are effected, how a check is drawn, what the liability is, how a check is transferred, who can be issued with a credit card, and so on. So I ask you to adopt them and have done with it. Any amendments would do no more than change the technical mechanism.

[Filatov] I put the draft decision to a vote. I ask you to vote. Thank you. It is passed. [Video shows electronic scoreboard; vote is 166 in favor, 3 against, with 2 abstentions]

Decree on Responsibility for Military Tribunals

PM1702145192 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Feb 92 First Edition p 3

["Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium Resolution on Military Tribunals" dated 13 January 1992 and signed by R.I. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet]

[Text] In connection with the abolition of the judicial power structures of the former USSR, the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium resolves:

1. To confer on the Russian Federation Ministry of Justice responsibility for organizational support of the activity of military tribunals located on the territory of the Russian Federation and in groups of forces. To this end, to incorporate into the Russian Federation Ministry of Justice the former USSR Ministry of Justice Military Tribunals Adminstration, with its organizational-personnel structure.

2. Pending the adoption of a new legislative act regulating the activity of military tribunals:

to deem the Statute on Military Tribunals ratified by the USSR Law of 25 December 1958 (VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR, 1959, No 1, p 14; 1980, No 27, p 546) to be in force on Russian Federation territory;

to maintain for personal of military tribunals, the Ministry of Justice Military Tribunals Administration, and also the Russian Federation Supreme Court Military Collegium the legal status of servicemen and all forms of monetary and other allowances;

the Russian Federation Government is to provide for the financing, supply, material-technical, and other support of these organs in 1992.

3. The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of Legality, Law and Order, and the Fight Against Crime is to prepare and present to the the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium before 1 February 1992 proposals on making the relevant additions to the Statute on a Unified System of Pay for Personnel of Law-enforcement Organs ratified by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium Resolution No 1897-1 of 18 November 1991.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet

Russian House of Soviets, Moscow, 13 January 1992

Treaty on Kyrgyzstan Relations Ratified

PM1402104592 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Feb 92 First Edition p 3

["Resolution of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet on the Ratification of the Treaty on the Fundamentals of Interstate Relations Between the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan," dated 23 January 1992 and signed by R.I. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To ratify the Treaty on the Fundamentals of Interstate Relations Between the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan signed in the city of Bishkek 21 July 1991.

2. With the aim of creating conditions conducive to good-neighborly and equitable relations between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan as two sovereign states, to instruct the Russian Federation Government to enter without delay into direct talks with the government of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan in order to prepare and sign agreements envisaged by the Treaty of 21 July 1991.

3. To instruct the Russian Federation Government to devote priority attention to the resolution of the following questions:

—ensuring and defending the rights and freedoms of the Russian minority in the Republic of Kyrgyzstan and of the Kyrgyz minority in the Russian Federation;

—ensuring the rights of citizens of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan to preserve or acquire citizenship of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan or the Russian Federation, according to their own freely expressed will;

—collaborating in foreign policy and foreign economic activity;

—the control of common systems of power, transport, information, and communications;

—ensuring the defenses of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan;

—providing guarantees for the social protection of servicemen;

—coordinating migration policy;

—regulating the legal status of Russian Federation and Republic of Kyrgyzstan property situated on the territory of the corresponding state, facilities belonging to the former USSR, and also the property of citizens.

4. To proceed on the basis that the Russian Federation intends to offer protection to its citizens resident on the territory of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan. Equally, the Russian Federation will encourage protection on the part of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan for its citizens resident on the territory of the Russian Federation.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet instructs the Russian Federation Ministry of Internal Affairs to hold prompt talks with the Kyrgyz side on the creation of a mechanism for this mutual protection and to report within two months on the results of the talks to the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet with a view to discussion of the prospects of Russian-Kyrgyz relations as a whole.

5. To involve a group of Russian Federation deputies in talks with the Republic of Kyrgyzstan as part of the Russian delegation.

[Signed] R.I. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet
Moscow, Russian House of Soviets
23 January 1992
No. 2234-1

Deputies Demand Referendum on Tatar Republic

LD1602053392 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 12 Feb 92

[Text] The holding of a referendum on Tatarstan joining the Russian Federation has been demanded by the People's Sovereignty [Narodovlastiye] deputies' group in the Republic's Supreme Soviet. The statement, signed by the group's coordinators, points out that Tatarstan's gradual, undeclared, and effective exit from the Russian Federation is taking place despite the fact that the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tatarstan has already adopted a decision on the need for a referendum to be held on the Republic's status.

Mint To Be Subordinated to Central Bank

OW1402161592 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1405 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Valeriy Skripchenko, the chairman of the parliamentary budget, planning, taxes and prices commission, said the Supreme Council of the Russian Federation "was drafting resolutions to subordinate the Russian mint (Goznak) to the central bank and to set up the central bank's gold reserve".

These moves were prompted by the difficulties facing the central bank while it tried to bring under control the liquidity shortage in some areas of the federation, since Goznak was incorporated into the government structure, while the central bank was required to report to the parliament, Skripchenko told IF [INTERFAX].

In another development, the Presidium of the Russian parliament has been drafting a resolution on an audit of the central bank to be conducted by foreign experts, he said. This move was not a sign of distrust in Russian

specialists but it was influenced by a consideration that only an expert opinion by a foreign firm with a good standing could clear the way for Russia to join the International Monetary Fund.

Regional Affairs

Local Communist Workers Party Holds Conference

LD1602012592 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 15 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Mikhail Utyanskiy]

[Text] St. Petersburg, 15 Feb (TASS)—The local organization of the Russian Communist Workers' Party [RCWP] has held its conference in St. Petersburg. It adopted a resolution saying that the RCWP has begun to "implement its minimum program—the dismissal of the current anti-popular administration from power." To implement this program, it is envisaged that soviets of workers, peasants, office workers, and servicemen—the political basis of the soviet power—be set up.

The conference supported the idea of holding a congress of USSR people's deputies on 17 March, and decided to hold rallies in support of the forum prior to its opening. Delegates elected the composition of the Leningrad Oblast committee of the RCWP.

Party Committees Reestablished

OW1402163492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1405 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Leaders of the St. Petersburg organization of the Russian Communist Workers' Party (RCWP) said Thursday [13 February] they intended to reestablish banned party committees of the former CPSU at all enterprises and organizations of St. Petersburg. The statement they issued stressed the reestablishment of the former Leningrad organization of the CPSU was "the party's urgent tactical objective which will mark a fair struggle of honest Communists to defend their honor and dignity". Local (RCWP) leaders said the reestablishment of party committees would begin following the party's regional conference scheduled for February 15.

Communist Conference Viewed

PM2002103092 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 p 1

[A. Molokov report: "Communists in the Tauride"]

[Text] St. Petersburg—Delegates arriving for the oblast conference of the Russian Communist Workers Party [RCWP]—which, incidentally, was officially registered more than a month ago—were not allowed beyond the lobby, where the power had been cut off, and were greeted on the steps of the building by some 15 pickets under the tricolor, with hastily scribbled placards denouncing the CPSU. The picket, it is true, stayed for exactly one hour.

Almost 500 delegates and more than 400 guests packed into the historic hall-amphitheater of the Tauride Palace.

History has taken a unique turn—thanks to the ban on the CPSU, Communists found themselves free in their actions for the first time. This idea, which was first voiced in the report on the tasks of the RCWP in modern conditions, was echoed and supported in the speeches of the delegates.

"We must not repeat the mistakes of the CPSU; we proclaim—no support for the political and economic course of the present government," the report stressed. The speakers in the debates shared their first independent experience of work among the masses, spoke of the need to consolidate and cooperate with patriotic movements, and stressed the importance of developing workers' self-government and reviving soviet power via the creation of soviets of working people at enterprises, in military units, and by territories...

A Leningrad RCWP Committee of 38 people was elected, 20 of whom are workers from industrial and agricultural enterprises. A plenum was held at which five secretaries to deal with different areas of work were elected, and Yu. Terentyev, member of the RCWP Central Committee, became first secretary.

Mayor Signs Accord With Unions, Businesses

LD1702162292 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Feb 92

[Text] An agreement between the mayor's office, the trade unions and the Union of Associations and Enterprises in industry, building, science, transport and communications, has just been signed in the Smolnyy, where the St. Petersburg mayor's office is situated. Here is what our correspondent Matvey Frolov reported by telephone:

[Begin Frolov recording] The point is to ensure constructive cooperation in the sphere of employment, the raising of the citizens' social guarantees and the protection of the most vulnerable groups of the population.

Individual sections of the agreement are devoted to the manpower market, the living standard, measures for protection of labor, privatization of state and municipal enterprises. Thus, for instance, the mayor's office has undertaken to make up a list of enterprises subject to privatization taking into account proposals, including aimed at maintaining and increasing employment of the population.

The mayor's office will monitor compliance with leasing licenses and contracts by organizations in trade, public catering and consumer services so that they stay within their category [profil] of work.

The mayor's office and the council of the Federation of Trade Unions will jointly approve the plan for the distribution of housing in the city for the year 1992. Envisaged are expenditures for the upkeep in summer of seven travelling health centers in the rayons where children's health improvement institutions are situated.

The mayor's office will foot the bill for and will ensure the financing of preschool institutions of enterprises which lack funds and possibilities to maintain them.

Speaking at the signing of the agreement were Sobchak, St. Petersburg's mayor; Makarov, chairman of the Leningrad Federation of Trade Unions; Kharchenko, president of the Union of Associations and Enterprises, head of the Baltic Maritime Shipping Line.

They all spoke of the need to jointly tackle all problems connected with the social protection of the population and to ensure constructive cooperation in resolving the most complicated and difficult problems in the city's life.

Regional, Local Leaders Meet in St. Petersburg

PM2002092392 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Vladimir Nevelskiy: "Government Accused of Being Overly Optimistic"]

[Text] St. Petersburg—There was a two-day conference in St. Petersburg attended by leaders of republic, kray, oblast, autonomous oblast, and autonomous okrug soviets and adiministration chiefs. Attention was focused on current tasks facing the legislative and executive authorities.

Opening the meeting, Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Chairman R. Khasbulatov noted that there is no sense in focusing attention on the errors made by the government in the course of the reforms, but it would be wrong to ignore them completely. In particular, the government has overlooked the problem of structural reforms. Unless the consumer sector of the economy is expanded, no innovations are going to succeed.

Nothing unpredictable has occurred during these six weeks, Russian Government deputy chairman A. Shokhin said in his speech. But some difficult work lies ahead. Demonopolization of the economy, privatization, and land reform will have to be carried out at the same time.

The conference participants expressed the view that the government had made a gross mistake by embarking on privatization only after prices were freed. "Yes, the correct approach would have been to have started implementing the privatization program much earlier," A. Chubays, chairman of the Russian Federation State Committee for the Management of State Property, agreed. "Then we would have had an entirely different situation now. But theories are theories, and life has its own ideas."

He said it was wrong to claim that the government had gotten carried away with a fiscal policy, stifling business and state enterprises with taxes, and that it regarded a zero budget deficit as an end in itself. Only after a measure of stabilization has been achieved in the financial situation," A. Chubays said, "will it be possible to use economic levers to increase the volume of production and output of consumer goods."

The government was accused of being overly optimistic in its assessment of the January results. The reply to this from the rostrum in the Mariinskiy Palace was: The government is satisfied only with the way the reform as a whole has gone, certainly not with the economic situation and the people's living standard. We have had a nerve-racking time on the consumer market, and the production sphere will suffer an even worse shock in the very near future. The country is facing a totally novel situation, where dozens of enterprises are about to come to a halt, not because of a shortage of raw material or components, but because the consumer is unable to pay for the products that are available. That kind of shock is the only way to make enterprises activate efficiency reserves, think about cutting prices and about selling off the fixed and circulating capital they do not need now. But the reformers must not go over the top. Indeed, too tough a financial policy in the production sphere could lead to its collapse.

It was decided to hold regular working meetings with the Supreme Soviet leadership and Russian Government.

Burbulis Postpones Visit to Komi Republic

LD2002091192 Moscow TASS in English 0753 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov]

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Republic, February 20—The situation in Vorkuta, the coal-mining area in the north of the Russian Federation, has sharply aggravated after it was learned that the visit of Russian Deputy Prime Minister Gennadiy Burbulis, who was expected to arrive in this polar city on Wednesday [19 February], is postponed to a later date.

An urgent telegram was sent to Russian President Boris Yeltsin, in which the regional coordinating strike committee of the sectoral trade unions of Vorkuta and Inta informed the Russian Government that these cities will in this case mount a general strike on February 21. The committee emphasised the responsibility for the consequences for the walkout rests with the Russian Government which marks time without solving the acute problems faced by the Pechora coalfield and its workers.

Vorkuta administration chief Aleksandr Segal told ITAR-TASS he received a telegram from Burbulis on Tuesday evening saying he will arrive in Vorkuta on Friday morning.

Popov Refuses Permission for 23 Feb Gatherings

OW1902201492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1902 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov did not grant permission to political parties and organizations to hold meetings on Manezh Square February 23. From 9 to 19.00 on that day the military orchestra will perform in the square and wreathes and flowers will be placed on the grave of the Unknown Soldier. The Russian President, republic and city officials, as well as military and social organizations will participate in the ceremonies.

At the same time, in the order passed by Popov, the Liberal Democratic Party will gather at the main entrance to Gorkiy Park, the "Soldiers for Democracy" at the Ostankino Television Center, the Fund of Social Initiatives at the main entrance to the All-Russian Exhibit Center (formerly VDNX), and the United Miners Front at the Theater of the Soviet Army.

However, aside from the "Soldiers for Democracy" movement, Popov did not grant permission for groups to demonstrate. A representative of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) threatened to sue the Mayor. "Trudovaya Russia" organized a picket at the Moscow City Hall in which 20 people participated.

Talks will continue February 20 at 14.00 in the Ministry of Interior Affairs of Russia at Petrovka 38. The head of Moscow Police Arkadiy Murashov invited representatives of oppostion parties and movements to attend.

Tatars Call For 'Sovereign Republic' in Siberia

LD1702135592 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0625 GMT 17 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Viktor Yeelmakov]

[Text] Novosibirsk, 17 Feb (TASS)— "Siberia should become a sovereign republic of Siberian Tatars", says a letter from a representative of those people, Spartak Abdulin, published today in SIBIRSKAYA GAZETA. He reminds its readers that before the advent of the armed forces of Yermak, a Siberian khanate existed, with its capital on the river Tobol. Under Soviet rule, autonomous formations of the Khakas, Altay, Shor, and other peoples appeared. Yet the Tatar people of Siberia still have no legal status. Sooner or later the problem of the Siberian Tatars will have to be discussed, the letter says.

In a commentary on the letter, the paper publishes figures according to which in Tyumen Oblast the Tatars make up 7.3 percent of the population, in Omsk Oblast 2.3 percent, in Novosibirsk Oblast 1.1 percent, and in Western Siberia as a whole about 3 percent; in Eastern Siberia there are even fewer Tatars.

Tatar Chairman Will Not Work in Supreme Soviet

LD1602203392 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1142 GMT 11 Feb 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Tatarstan's Supreme Soviet Chairman Farid Mukhametshin has officially stated he has no intention to work in the Supreme Soviet of Russia. In his February 14 statement for the mass media, Mukhametshin said that he considered Russian legislature's House of Nationalities suggestion to make heads of Supreme Soviets of all the Republics, which are part of the Russian Federation, deputies to Russian Parliamentary Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov, to be unacceptable, as far as he was concerned.

Udmurt Paper Loses Supreme Soviet Financing

LD1602063292 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0900 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Text] Today the UDMURTSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper reached its readership without the usual lines about one of its founders. The republic's Supreme Soviet has refused to finance the newspaper. The journalists need several million rubles for normal work.

The editorial board had been expecting assistance from the deputies, but the Supreme Soviet set up its own newspaper, IZVESTIYA UDMURTSKOY RESPUBLIKI, so now the editorial of UDMURTSKAYA PRAVDA must itself found a way out of this difficult situation.

Buryat Republic Appeals to Yeltsin, Government

LD1602072592 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Text] The Parliament of the Buryat Soviet Socialist Republic [as heard] has appealed to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the president of the Russian Federation to provide Buryatia with assistance in improving its social and economic situation. The appeal, adopted today at the session of the republic's Supreme Soviet,

states those measures which, in the deputies' opinion, would help to alleviate the crisis situation in the former autonomous formation. They include placing thirty to forty percent of the output produced on its territory at Buryatia's disposal, and granting the republican government the right to purchase gold.

Bashkir Supreme Soviet Annuls Land Resolution

LD1602061192 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0800 GMT 13 Feb 92

[Text] The presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Bashkir Republic has annulled the resolution of the government on urgent measures to implement land reform and on procedures for the reorganization of collective and state farms. This is because private ownership of land has not been recognized in Bashkortostan. In addition, many rural toilers are coming out in support of collective and state farms, and are threatening to resort to strikes if reorganization of farms is forced on them.

Ryazan Oblast Protests Moscow Food Subsidies

PM2002101892 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 17 Feb 92 First Edition p 1

[Report from ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, TASS roundup: "Subsidies in the Capital, Budget Undermined in Ryazan?"]

[Text] The Ryazan Oblast administration has judged the unilateral introduction in Moscow of an additional subsidy for milk as an infringement of the existing government statute on fixed prices for food products, and as an action disregarding the neighboring oblasts' fundamental interests.

As we know the decision to sell goods coming in from abroad in the form of humanitarian aid and to direct the considerable funds thus raised into the social protection of badly off sections of society, through subsidies on food prices among other things, is being implemented in the capital. But in other oblasts, including Ryazan Oblast, this foreign aid is incomparably less than in the capital, and the opportunities here for additional subsidy are correspondingly practically zero.

International Affairs

Kravchuk Proposes Nuclear Talks With U.S.

LD1902231692 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 2200 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] A meeting was held in Kiev today between the President of Ukraine, Leonid Kravchuk, and journalists. The quintessence of the press conference in Kiev became a proposal made by Leonid Kravchuk, which for the first time was announced at this press conference, to include Ukraine as well as other republics having nuclear weapons on their territories into the negotiating process on nuclear disarmament. The process which was started between the Soviet Union and the United States has to be completed by the four republics and the United States—four plus one. I suggest, said the President, the second stage as well so that we should advance further and involve in this process all nuclear states.

President of Ukraine replied to a wide range of questions pertaining in the main to the destiny of the Commonwealth of Independent States. He stressed once again that the Commonwealth of Independent States is not a state, and not a state formation, and this factor must determine all the principle decisions of the Commonwealth.

Leonid Kravchuk said that, referring to the European experience of integration, it is groundless since the Commonwealth states must go along the historically necessary road of establishment and development of independent national states which must precede integration.

Touching on issues of creating Ukraine's own armed forces, Leonid Kravchuk underlined that this decision does not run counter to the documents jointly adopted by the Commonwealth member states. Only a single state can have a united army, but the Commonwealth is not a united state.

Speaking on the Ukraine's stand in relation to the Black Sea Fleet Leonid Kravchuk said that the republic had never made any claims to its complete possession—it can claim only a part of the Fleet. In the opinion of Leonid Kravchuk this is 30 percent. Ukraine wants to create its own navy which would exclusively fulfill the functions of border protection.

Asked why Ukraine is voluntarily striving to get rid of its nuclear arsenal which adds strength and weight in foreign politics, Leonid Kravchuk replied that Ukraine wants to become a strong economic state and not carry a heavy nuclear burden. Ukraine is situated in the center of Europe, on the crossroads of the main east-west highways and wants to become a neutral state.

Leonid Kravchuk subjected to criticism the encroachment of certain forces on Ukrainian territory. The revision of borders contradicts the Final Helsinki Act and Ukraine is going to sign it this year.

Comments on Crimea

LD1902202292 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev February 19 TASS—Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk has again reiterated Ukraine's intention to become a nuclear-free power.

"Our state wants to have a strong economy, rather than missiles. Ukraine's geopolitical and strategic position dictated to us the idea of a neutral state that can serve as an example to others. We will be maintaining this position, unconditionally," Kravchuk said.

Asked about the future of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Ukrainian president pointed out that it will to a great extent depend on the understanding of the (need) to create genuinely-independent states. The Commonwealth of Independent States is not a state, a federation or a confederation, but an association of sovereign states. This is what Ukraine's resolute stance on a single armed force is based on, he said. There could be no single army, because it will take orders from one commander and not heads of state and this could lead to unpredictable consequences, he said.

Asked if Ukraine will leave the Commonwealth of Independent States, Kravchuk said that it will if there are attempts to change it into a new USSR. However, if the process continues in line with previous agreements, it will help tap the Commonwealth's potential.

Commenting on the Crimea, Kravchuk expressed certainty that it will remain Ukrainian. Any other option would violate decisions of the Helsinki Conference. Speaking about the Black Sea Fleet, the Ukrainian president stressed that Ukraine does not lay claims on the entire fleet, it simply wants to create its own fleet on its basis, which will not have strategic tasks, say in the Mediterranean sea, but will have just one aim—to protect Ukraine's interests. Thirty percent of the Black Sea Fleet will be enough for that, according to Kravchuk.

Asked about debt servicing, Kravchuk said Ukraine will be able to pay its share of the former Soviet foreign debt. However, much is still unclear in this respect. An international conference on debt servicing to be held in Kiev will hopefully clear things up, he said.

Speaking about relations between Ukraine and Russia, Kravchuk emphasised that there are no conflicts between their people, but some forces in Russia, including, unfortunately, in the parliament, are creating conflicts, pursuing their political, imperial ends.

At the Commonwealth summit in Kiev on March 20, the sides will discuss three groups of questions: sharing Soviet property, military-political documents and economic issues.

Black Sea Fleet 'Sell-Off' Viewed

PM2002100092 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Sergey Tsikora report: "Sell-Off of Black Sea Fleet Has Begun. Leonid Kravchuk Reported This at News Conference in Kiev"]

[Text] Kiev—A wave of alarming rumors has swept through Ukraine. In recent days the republic's newspapers and radio and television stations have been reporting the secret sell-off of warships, the hijacking of military aircraft, a suspicious fuss over the printing of the new Ukrainian money in Canada. Naturally, these "hot" topics were not forgotten by journalists at Ukrainian President L. Kravchuk's latest news conference.

Alas, the worst of the rumors were confirmed. Journalists were shown a document relating to an investigation conducted by specialists in Sevastopol concerning the fact of "writing off and selling Black Sea Fleet ships." A depressing picture. On the one hand, the fleet's command maintains that on no account must warships be shared out among the Commonwealth states, as they constitute a single strategic whole. On the other hand, on instructions from the same command, "equipment, armaments, and property are being intensively written off, prepared, and sold. Lists have been prepared for the sale of 49 ships and vessels of the fleet. Most of the 15 submarines written off in 1991 have already been sold. The cruiser Zhdanov was sold to India for $2.2 million. It is proposed to write off submarines, patrol escorts, minesweepers, a missile patrol boat, the destroyer Svedushchiy, and amphibious warfare ships this year—13 units in all."

When I submitted this information to Russian President B. Yeltsin, Ukrainian President L. Kravchuk said, it turned out that he knows nothing about this aspect of the admirals' activity. It also proved a new question to Marshal of Aviation Ye. Shaposhnikov, commander of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Armed Forces. The fact that the "Nevikon-zyuyd" joint-stock company conducts all commercial activity with regard to selling ships also came as a surprise to the Russian head. The company was set up "on the basis of a founding treaty of 14 November 1991 between the fleet in the person of Vice Admiral Vasilyev, deputy commander of the fleet and chief of its rear services, and the 'Nevikon' joint-stock company (Moscow) in the person of Vice Admiral Makhonin, chairman of the board."

"Competent Ukrainian organs are now verifying the lawfulness of the sell-off of the Black Sea Fleet's warships and vessels," L. Kravchuk said. "If the appropriate legal support for these actions is not forthcoming, the decisions to sell military hardware will be countermanded as actions undertaken on the territory of a sovereign state without its consent. This is not only a juridical but also a political question. It will undoubtedly surface in March at the Kiev meeting of heads of the Commonwealth countries."

However, this statement did not close the naval subject. It has turned out that the virus of the ships' sell-off has already infected maritime shipping companies. At the Ukrainian president's news conference journalists were issued with a photocopy of a telegram from Pilipenko, leader of "Ukrmorflot," addressed to the head of the republic. Here is just one paragraph from that telegram: "The Russian Transport Ministry is intensively selling abroad ships belonging to the 'Sovmestnyy Kommercheskiy Flot' [Joint Commercial Fleet] (Sovkomflot) interstate joint-stock enterprise. Of the 25 ships operated by the Black Sea Maritime Shipping Company, five motor vessels with a total carrying capacity of 186,000 tonnes have already been sold. Another six vessels have been put on sale, including the passenger motor ship Maksim Gorkiy. The motor vessel Aytodor, for example, with a carrying capacity of more than 57,000 tonnes, has been sold for $3.2 million, which is less than the value of the scrap metal. The purchaser turned out to be the firm of 'Tekhimeks'-Moscow, which is headed by former leaders of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet."

The Ukrainian president mentioned these facts but did not comment on them, probably in the belief that all is clear here anyway. But it was possible to conclude from the amount of time he devoted to military questions that L. Kravchuk is now paying a very great deal of attention to this problem. He repeated once again his thesis that the creation of unified armed forces in the CIS will lead, in his opinion, to a situation in which the military will cease to reckon with the opinion of the states on whose territory they are stationed.

He cited as an example a recent case when an attempt was made, without consulting Ukraine, to raise and transfer an airborne division from Odessa Oblast to one of the CIS states to participate in resolving some conflict. The most recent instance in this series was the hijacking of six Su-24M bomber aircraft from an air unit stationed in Khmelnitskiy Oblast. The hijackers stole not only combat hardware but also a military banner. The Ukrainian president sent the Russian president a telegram describing the act of hijacking combat machines as a preplanned criminal act contravening existing international agreements and Ukrainian legislation. The fact of the hijacking of combat aircraft and the stealing of the combat banner, the telegram states, "could give rise to a whole chain of negative phenomena, ranging from the mass transfer of hardware to the banning of its use even in cases of extreme need—which could have an adverse effect on the international assessment of the processes taking place in the CIS."

It evidently will not be easy for Ukraine and Russia to have this matter out with each other. On the Ukrainian side military counterintelligence and the national security service are ascertaining the circumstances of what happened. A no less interesting investigation is also expected in the republic's parliament, as the Ukrainian president reported. It is to investigate the fact of the conclusion of a contract to print the new money with a firm which, according to certain information, does not

possess the necessary technical base for this and is trying to realize the order with the help of other firms—which, naturally, offers no guarantee against the production of "extra" bank notes. The republic newspaper PRAVDA UKRAINY recently carried an article casting doubt on the professionalism and ethics of the actions of a number of officials and deputies involved in the problem of producing new bank notes in Ukraine...

Time will show what the investigation will produce and what conclusion the parliamentarians will arrive at. Among the significant events in the near future L. Kravchuk named the signing of a new economic agreement between Ukraine and Russia. A discussion of its points constituted the subject of a meeting between the two presidents during their recent stay in Minsk. According to L. Kravchuk, they approved the conceptual approaches enshrined in the agreement. The document was not signed in Minsk only because they did not have time to make several elaborations to it. The Ukrainian president did not cite any specific points from that agreement at the news conference, but he emphasized that this document "is long-awaited" by the sides.

Kravchuk Cable to Yeltsin on Bombers

PM1902214192 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 92 p 2

[Correspondent O. Musafirova report: "'Rooks' Awaiting a Cage?"]

[Text] Kiev—President Kravchuk has sent President Yeltsin a telegram: "Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich! We report that at 1540 hours on 13 February, six Su-24M bombers were hijacked [ugnano] to Russian territory from Starokonstantinov Airfield. This act was premeditated by Lieutenant Colonel V.P. Chernyy, deputy commander of a combined unit, and Lieutenant Colonel A.I. Krishtop, chief of staff at a bomber air regiment. Armed Forces personnel learned with indignation of this crime, which contravenes existing international agreements and Ukrainian legislation. The hijacking of the warplanes and the misappropriation of the combat banner could generate a whole chain of negative phenomena—from massive transfers [peregon] of equipment to the prohibition of its use even in cases of extreme need, which could have a negative impact on the international assessment of the processes taking place within the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]. I would ask you, Boris Nikolayevich, to make a political and legal assessment of these illegal actions and to take measures to return the offenders, equipment, and combat banner. Respectfully, L. Kravchuk"

The military prosecutor's office, together with military counterintelligence organs and the Ukrainian National Security Service for Khmelnitskiy Oblast, has instituted criminal proceedings in relation to the aircraft hijacking. An investigation is under way. And another flight of "rooks" [Russian nickname for Su-24], in particular over Poltava, marked the fact that the strategic aviation units stationed in the city has stopped hesitating and has sworn a mass oath of loyalty to Ukraine.

Commonwealth Meeting in Minsk Viewed

LD1702064192 Kiev Radio Kiev First Program Network in Ukrainian 0600 GMT 15 Feb 92

[Excerpts] [Announcer] We will start with yesterday's main event: the Commonwealth meeting in Minsk. Our correspondent Oleksandr Budko has just returned from there. But first, the following question: there were many rumors and discussion as to whether President Kravchuk will go to Minsk or not.

[Budko] Good morning. I do not know—at least I did not participate in rumors and discussion. I [word indistinct] knew I would fly with the Ukraine president to Minsk a week earlier, and this was not in doubt at any time. However, I read with surprise in Moscow newspapers that they savored the likelihood or unlikelihood of the Ukrainian president going to Minsk.

[Announcer] I understood [word indistinct] in the answers that you knew about it in advance but there was a problem yesterday because a strike by Ukrainian air traffic controllers was set for yesterday. In fact, the president's takeoff itself was threatened.

[Budko] The air traffic controllers of Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine finally agreed earlier that they would postpone this strike until 21 February. It is possible they did not want to put presidents elected by the people in an awkward situation.

[Announcer] Well, that is an important reason. And now the main thing under discussion: military issues. Would you please provide more details?

[Budko] Yes, although I would not say that only military issues were the focus of attention. Generally there were a great many issues adopted at this meeting, although, true, military ones were a considerable part of them. Well, for instance [issues were discussed] on coordination or—to be more precise—on the highest military bodies of the Commonwealth, on the military structure, on the fact that some states are creating united armed forces for a transitional period and those that have already started building them are continuing to build them.

[Announcer] Excuse me, that concerns Ukraine?

[Budko] Ukraine takes part in strategic armed forces only for a transitional period because we have not gotten completely rid of nuclear weapons yet. As is known, nuclear weapons here are for strategic use. Therefore, evidently, it would be improper not to take part in this agreement. [not further identified] Incidentally, President Leonid Makarovych Kravchuk singled out this very idea at the news conference on the results of this meeting. I want to say that for a long time the press was there with minimal information—although not completely lacking information.

[Announcer] Was this before the news conference?

[Budko] Yes, before the news conference. Everybody was interested in learning about some specific results. However, we correspondents of the Ukrainian Television and Radio Company and UKRINFORM were given a chance to come to the hall during the signing of documents, whereas dozens of our colleagues were waiting in the press center with, I repeat, minimal information. These agreements were being signed, as was the protocol on establishing diplomatic relations between Ukraine and Russia. At the same time we talked with the Ukraine president, who gave himself a grade of B-. He gave a detailed assessment of the meeting while opening the news conference that he held as chairman of the Minsk meeting. We will now listen to this clip. I want to warn you that I recorded it from a loudspeaker.

[Begin Kravchuk recording in Russian] It has become a tradition for us that heads of states and governments of literally all states of the Commonwealth take part in councils and talks. This indicates great interest of every state in such meetings and the importance of documents that are adopted. A wide range of military, political, and economic issues was examined. A separate group of issues was international legal issues, including legal succession concerning property, treaties, state debts of the former union, on returning cultural and historical values to states of their origin, and on observing principles of the Commonwealth in the framework of the Commonwealth.

In the course of a fairly intensive and frank exchange of views, 20 documents were agreed on and signed. I want to say that we never managed to sign so many documents as we did this time. I know there were beliefs that there would probably be complications—I would say among journalists, but not just them. There were certainly complications—there were acute discussions of certain issues. I want to say that in general an atmosphere of benevolence prevailed at the meeting, which made it possible to reach a solution in spite of the variety of approaches. I must point out that many issues were submitted at sessions and a number of initiatives were proposed. We failed to examine them all and adopt final decisions due to a lack of time, but this does not mean these issues were removed from the agenda. The decision was made to examine them again at the next session, which will be held in Kiev in the second half of March.

I, as chairman of this meeting, would like to point out the concern of participants in finding the most optimum solution to the most topical issues. The future of certain services of the armed forces—mainly the strategic ones—social security and other kinds of security for servicemen and their families; and providing the armed forces with arms, equipment, and materials can be related to such issues. It goes without saying that considerable attention was paid at the meeting to economic cooperation and a search for effectively regulating it. I can say without exaggeration that we never succeeded before in adopting such documents on economic issues as those that have been adopted and signed today. Namely: a common approach to solving economic issues has been found, all obstacles for concluding treaties have been removed, and, what is more important, measures have also been defined to restore economic contacts between enterprises. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Announcer] Here is another question: Was the issue of the Black Sea Fleet, which is so much talked about, discussed during this meeting in Minsk?

[Budko] I want to say that the Black Sea Fleet will be discussed specifically and in earnest at the next session, which will take place on 20 March in Kiev. However, there was some news with regard to this. For instance, Georgian Defense Minister (Sharashenidze)—the Georgian delegation was present as an observer—said in an interview with foreign correspondents during the break that Georgia will also lay claim to part of the Black Sea Fleet. By the way, Georgia was present as an observer but it expressed an opinion or adopted a statement that was taken into account by leaders of Commonwealth countries that it will probably join the Commonwealth after democratic elections are held in Georgia and the parliament adopts a specific decision concerning that.

There is more about the fleet. It is possible that this is already known to some radio listeners, but I want to say that, evidently, another serious scandal is becoming unavoidable because a memorandum concerning the merchant fleet has gotten into the hands of your correspondent—just as it has into the hands of some other correspondents—about the fact that the Russian Ministry of Transport is selling abroad the ships that belong to the Joint Commercial Fleet joint-stock interstate enterprise. Yes, out of 25 ships that are part of the Black Sea Steamship Line, five steamships with a total freight capacity of 186,000 tonnes have already been sold. Six more ships, including the Maksim Gorkiy passenger steamship, have been put up for sale. One can judge how these ships are being sold on the following: the (?Iytotor) steamship with a freight capacity of more than 57,000 tonnes was sold for 3.2 million dollars—which is lower than the price of scrap metal. And the Tekhimpeks company in Moscow, which is headed by former leaders of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet, turned out to be the buyer.

At his news conference, Leonid Makarovych Kravchuk was asked a question about this and about warships and a number of submarines. Leonid Makarovych Kravchuk said he had irrefutable proof that there are organizations profiting from this.

[Announcer] Oleksandr, you said at the beginning that not all republics agreed to take part in that military agreement. What republics are these?

[Budko] Well, in my reports I named the three that took a tough position: Ukraine, Azerbaijan, and Moldova. Two other states—Belarus and Armenia—expressed a different point of view. This point of view is closer to the position of Ukraine, Moldova, and Azerbaijan than to

that of the Central Asian states and Russia, which want to have their own—sorry, united—armed forces.

[Announcer] Thank you, I understood. One last question: It is very interesting whether President Kravchuk met with Russian President Yeltsin.

[Budko] This question was also heard throughout the news conference and the Ukraine president said he had been meeting with Yeltsin intensively. They talked all of the time both during the sessions and during breaks. But at the news conference it was stated that there would still be a tete-a-tete meeting after the news conference. According to our information, this meeting took place, but you have to understand that at 0100 in the morning we did not dare disturb the president by asking whether it had taken place and what had happened. I guess the Ukraine president's news conference on the results of the Minsk meeting will be held—a news conference for Ukrainian journalists and those foreign correspondents accredited in Kiev. We will have details then.

[Announcer] Thank you. That was our correspondent Oleksandr Budko who has just returned from Minsk from the Commonwealth meeting.

Kuwaiti Oil Minister Holds Talks in Kiev

LD1802170892 Kiev Radio Kiev in English 2200 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Text] The Government of Kuwait is interested in the perspective of trade exchange with Ukraine. It sent the minister of finance, Nasir 'Abdallah al-Rudan, for talks in Kiev. Today he held talks with the ministers of economy and foreign economic ties of Ukraine, Anatoliy Mishchenko and Valeriy Kravchenko. Issues were in part discussed on the supplies of Kuwaiti oil to Ukraine.

National Affairs

Morozov Says Armed Forces Creation No Threat

AU1902193392 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 13 Feb 92 p 5

[Interview with Colonel General Konstantin Morozov, minister of defense of Ukraine, by Pavol Vitek in Kiev; date not given: "We Are Not a Threat to Anyone"]

[Text] [Vitek] What are the main reasons that led Ukraine to organize its own Armed Forces?

[Morozov] The Commonwealth established on 8 and 21 December, when 11 representatives of independent states signed protocols in Minsk and Alma-Ata, declared that it considers itself neither a state nor a state superstructure. All republics develop their interrelations on the basis of equality and national sovereignty. Hence, the Commonwealth cannot have joint armed forces regardless of the internal republic laws. The possibility has not been ruled out, however, that the states that want joint Armed Forces can have them. The Ukrainian parliament adopted the concept of building its own Armed Forces.

The troops currently deployed in Ukraine cannot be considered the Ukrainian Army. The part of these forces armed with strategic and tactical nuclear weapons is a component of the common Armed Forces. They are subordinate to the united Moscow command. As you know, the deployment of nuclear arms in Ukraine is of temporary character.

[Vitek] How large will your Army be?

[Morozov] We will base its size solely on defense needs. It will not be a threat to anyone. We will fully respect the conclusions of the Paris and Vienna talks on conventional armed forces, and the individual quotas for the Commonwealth states will be set in their joint sessions.

[Vitek] Can you be specific about numbers?

[Morozov] It will be determined by the parliament. First, we must deal responsibly with the social program, secure housing for the soldiers, and other necessities including conditions of the pension plan, and then—as these tasks are dealt with—we can reduce the Army. We do not want to create a situation causing strong social tensions in the Army.

[Vitek] The advocates of the platform of a united armed forces argue that the expected costs of the reorganization of the Army and building of national armies can be greater in the final analysis than the union budget spending has been, and that the present disrupted economy cannot bear them. What do you think?

[Morozov] They used to frighten us by saying that the collapse of the USSR would be a world catastrophe. The union no longer exists, and we have gotten used to it. The same is being said of the Armed Forces. After all, judge for yourself, how could independent states have a united armed forces? You will not find an example of that anywhere in the world. They can build them jointly, if the states agree on that and adopt corresponding laws. Ukraine believes that each independent state has the right to its own army. Moreover, the Minsk document unequivocally confirms it. Therefore, since 3 January, Ukraine utilizes this right. You spoke about the costs. For over 70 years we have substantially contributed to the national product of the union, a portion of which went to financing the defense needs. The Ukrainian people have never learned whether the funds were effectively employed. Furthermore, I believe that a smaller army will require less money. The Ukrainian nation is still willing to make certain sacrifices.

[Vitek] What is the basic philosophy of your military doctrine?

[Morozov] Today, Ukraine is not a threat to anybody, and it does not want to be one in the future. Our future is that of a neutral state without nuclear weapons, which will not figure in any military bloc. The fundamental theses of our military doctrine include the following:

Ukraine does not have any territorial demands against other states; it does not consider any nation its enemy; it will never initiate a military operation against anyone as the aggressor; Ukraine rejects the use of military power in general and the threat of power as a means to achieve certain goals.

[Vitek] The transformation of the former Soviet Army is an ongoing process. How long do you think it will take, and of what does the current Ukrainian Army consist?

[Morozov] At this time, the Ukrainian National Army is formed of individual units and divisions, in which personal stands of the command and soldiers are being clarified on the basis of a voluntary declaration of state citizenship. It is on this basis alone that a soldier can voluntary decide whether he wants to serve in the Ukrainian Army and take the oath. We are not forcing anyone to anything. Starting on 3 January, our troops on Ukrainian territory have been completely under our jurisdiction, and practical steps have been initiated to build the Army—the entire process should take three to five years.

[Vitek] Do you believe that the problem of dividing the Black Sea Fleet is the last obstacle on the way to the reorganization of the former Soviet Army and its transformation on Ukrainian territory, or do you expect more problems in the future?

[Morozov] We do not expect a smooth ride for the process. Unfortunately, there will be more problems in the near future. Regarding the Black Sea Fleet, I am convinced that it is an artificially exaggerated problem. This type of calling for conflicts is neither in the interest of Ukraine, nor in the interest of Russia. Furthermore, the world community at large is beginning to express unnecessary concerns. There is nothing difficult about this problem, and I do not think that there is a need for the world's uneasiness. If I am to be frank, I believe that some high-ranking officials of the former USSR Defense Ministry are simply worried about their posts and are therefore attempting to demonstrate the need for the maintenance of the Black Sea Fleet in the name of some great strategic plans.

[Vitek] So far, you have held talks with the Polish, Romanian, and Hungarian defense ministers. Do you expect to meet with the CSFR partners in the near future?

[Morozov] I have met with the Czechoslovak military attache twice in Moscow. I told him about our concept of building our Armed Forces and expressed our exceptionally warm feelings for the CSFR. I am not ruling out the possibility that your defense minister and I will meet, be it on my own initiative or his.

Official Killed in Explosion After Interview

Calls Russia 'Arrogant'

MK1502082292 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 Feb 92 p 3

[Interview with Vadim Boyko, deputy chairman of Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Standing Commission on Glasnost, by Vladimir Kiyanin; date and place not given; first paragraph is introduction: "'I Have No Button, But I Can Offer Dictionaries'; Deputy Chairman of Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Glasnost Standing Commission Urges Journalists Not To Be 'Moors'"]

[Text] Vadim Boyko became known in Ukraine as the host of the youth program "Gart" (the Ukrainian equivalent of "Vzglyad"). That was how he became a Ukrainian parliamentary deputy. An article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 6 February (written by one B. Karlov) brought him some popularity within the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] by announcing that he has a "button" capable of pulling the plug on 'Ostankino' television on Ukrainian territory."

[Kiyanin] Vadim, do you really have this notorious button?

[Boyko] I read that article in KOMSOMOLKA and had a long laugh. But it would have really been funny had it not been so serious. This article appeared after I had held talks in Moscow in my capacity as deputy chairman of the glasnost commission with Yegor Yakovlev, chairman of "Ostankino" TV, regarding what was Central Television's unobjective coverage of events in Ukraine and, to be precise, the programs' biased, one-sided, anti-Ukrainian thrust. The results of the talks were fairly positive. First we agreed that Central Television First Program must be the Commonwealth program. If it is a Russian program, many CIS states will clearly simply try to change its status and even move it to a different channel.

Second, we agreed that each instance of nonobjective coverage would be investigated and the reasons for it ascertained. That is already happening in principle. Igor Malyshenko, Yakovlev's political adviser, conducted an investigation of this kind into one program on Sevastopol that showed a Black Sea ensign saying why he had sworn an oath to Ukraine and wanted to serve in its navy. The next day the same man was shown without sound, with a commentary to the opposite effect by Tatyana Komarova saying that seamen did not want to swear an oath to Ukraine but were being made to do so.

Naturally, after these blunders our parliament suggested "getting rid" of the First Channel. I was glad that we reached a common position during the talks. Then suddenly this article in KOMSOMOLKA appeared... Despite the fact that, during the debates on the first channel as a "source of anti-Ukrainian hysteria," I was always opposed to pulling the plug on it. I did not want to be like an ostrich burying its head in the sand.

[Kiyanin] How did the report about the button appear?

[Boyko] During an interview with Radio Liberty [RL] I spoke about the status of the First Channel. Since the CIS is an alliance of countries rather than a single country, Ukraine has a single local television channel and two central channels, which are effectively foreign channels. I said that it is not a question of its being inadvisable to use these channels but of making fuller use of them. When RL's correspondent asked whether Central Television could technically have the plug pulled on it in Ukraine, I naturally said that of course it could. But I immediately added that we can only be forced to this, forced to press some button or key. My words were simply misinterpreted.

[Kiyanin] What do you intend to do?

[Boyko] I recently went up to President Kravchuk and jokingly asked whether he had been given the nuclear button, because if not I could share "mine" with him. We laughed, of course, but this is after all, I repeat, a sad and serious matter, since it leaves a distressing impression of some journalists' integrity. When I was a student at the school of journalism we had a special course entitled "Methods of Counterpropaganda." We had to learn to "rebut" the "enemy's voices" without listening to them. Evidently this "experience" stood KOMSOMOLKA in very good stead: They "rebutted" me without listening to me on RL, evidently without understanding Ukrainian, and citing an unknown agency, KHARKOV-NOVOSTI. They also said wicked ugly things about me and about my colleagues from Ukrainian TV. People may have different attitudes to us, but we should not be treated so condescendingly and arrogantly.

Russian television and radio stations currently broadcast in Ukraine. The question of increasing this in areas with large Russian or Russian-speaking populations is being raised. Why does KOMSOMOLKA not raise, for instance, the question of Ukrainian radio and television broadcasting in areas of Russia with a large Ukrainian population? There are, after all, millions of Ukrainians there. It would be an equal exchange of programs. Ukraine could also provide technical assistance. But this meets with opposition.

Today we can only be colleagues if we are totally honest. We are in the Commonwealth [sodruzhestvo]. The root of the word "sodruzhestvo" is "drug" [friend]. We will never become real friends until we realize that we must unite and prevent society sliding into catastrophe, toward enmity among the peoples. If we do not do this we will cease to be journalists. We will be "moors" [mavry]: today we will go our own way, and tomorrow we will all be destroyed, one by one.

I will not file charges, because I have never felt hostility toward my Russian colleagues. And I will obviously send KOMSOMOLKA by way of humanitarian aid a set of Ukrainian-Russian dictionaries, so that if necessary they will translate what I say accurately next time.

Death Investigated

MK1802130392 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 18 Feb 92 p 3

[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA report under the "In Brief" rubric: "Ukraine"]

[Text] On the day that NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA published an interview with 30-year-old Vadim Boyko, deputy [zamestitel] of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Standing Commission for Questions of Glasnost and the Mass Media, 14 February, there was an explosion in his apartment in Kiev. The deputy died. The apartment was burned to the ground despite firefighters' efforts. It is suspected that highly combustible special systems were used, possibly napalm. Criminal proceedings have been instigated.

As a result of the incipient investigation it is known that the janitor at the house where Boyko lived had on several occasions noticed strangers near his apartment who looked as though they might be shadowing him. There is also the supposition that Boyko may in the course of his own particular journalist's investigation have stumbled upon mafia structures and that they "did away" with him.

The Ukrainian Ministry of Internal Affairs Press Center said that the investigation operations group has ascertained for starters that the fire could have been caused by a color television catching fire and exploding. There are no signs on the body of a violent death.

Government Nationalizes Communist Party Property

OW1802203792 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1922 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] All property of the Ukrainian Communist Party on the republican territory is made state property by a Ukrainian law made public on Tuesday [18 February].

The law defines as the Communist Party property all its enterprises and organizations, cash, shares, stock and other securities and property rights wherever located.

The party's administrative structures will be used to house courts, medical and cultural facilities. Some of the structures in Kiev will house foreign embassies and central bodies of power of Ukraine.

The law commands commercial structures that received investments or other assets from the Communist Party to submit reports of these investments and assets to Ukraine's Public Property Fund before March 1, 1992.

Fleet Ready To 'Help' Build Ukraine Force

MK1902084492 Moscow Radio Sto Odin in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Andrey Tumanov report from the Crimea]

[Text] Now I would like to bring to your attention the latest report from Crimea filed by our correspondent Andrey Tumanov.

[Begin Tumanov recording] Sevastopol, which is known as the City of Russian glory, is not experiencing the best of times. The city residents grimly joke that they are engaged in the third defense. The city is short on water and electricity, milk is being allocated only for children and pregnant women, and there are few vehicles on the streets because of a lack of gasoline. Overall, however, the situation is calm.

According to Ivan Yermakov, chairman of the Sevastopol City Soviet, the city is benefiting from Ukraine's influence on the food supply. He assessed the economic situation as extremely complex. Asked what he thinks about the city's future, he said that the city was created for the fleet and lives by the fleet. He sees two ways out of the current situation. The first would see the city placed on the CIS or Ukrainian budgets, the second would have the city declared a free economic zone. Concerning the future referendum, he noted that it apparently will be held but thought it hardly timely.

Captain Third Rank Nikolay Savchenko, representative of the fleet command, said the following concerning full independence for the Crimea: It would not be a bad thing, because it would help preserve the fleet, although we understand the desire of the Ukraine to have its own naval forces. We are ready to help them in this. However, the Ukrainian leaders are unwilling to listen to us and do not even phone us. As far as the oath is concerned, Captain Third Rank Savchenko said that 90 percent of the personnel had taken the CIS oath. Those that wished to do so took the Ukrainian oath. The problem of the fleet, he said, must be solved by the politicians, but they are concerning themselves with everything but this issue.

Nikolay Savchenko also discounted rumors about a decrease in fleet activity and stated that the fleet is discharging in full all the tasks set by the commander in chief of the Navy. [end recording]

Tomorrow Andrey Tumanov is returning to St. Petersburg, so that in the near future we expect to be able again to bring you the hottest news from that city.

Over 300 Republic Soldiers Reportedly Desert

LD2002045792 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Feb 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] In Ukraine, the first deserters have been reported in the military units that have transferred to the yellow-and-blue badges [of Ukraine's armed forces]. According to newspaper reports, over 300 servicemen have voluntarily left their subunits recently in the Kiev Military District.

Party Elite Reportedly Built Secret Shelters

AU1902201692 Kiev NARODNA HAZETA in Ukrainian No. 3 (32), Jan 92 p 5

[Commentary by Vasyl Vecherskyy, senior lecturer at the Kiev State Institute of Culture: "Bunkers for the Nomenklatura"]

[Text] Several years ago I learned from secret documents containing a construction design that the Communist Party nomenklatura, together with the military complex, had built luxurious underground shelters for themselves, while preparing a nuclear war for us. One could see from the design documents that A. Hitler's bunker, as it is known in the press, was a mere cave compared with the size and luxury of the shelter meant for the oblast party. Apart from the huge area with premises for various service needs, several automated systems for turning on emergency lighting, air conditioning, water supply, and so on were provided for in the design. That secret project belonged to the Chernihiv party bureaucracy. However, I believe that Chernihiv was not the only place where such underground palaces were built. Perhaps, the party bosses of every oblast prepared such bunkers for themselves. An employee from a metro construction organization told me about such a shelter built for Kiev bosses. According to his information, there is an underground shelter beneath the "Arsenalna" metro station [in Kiev's Pechersk district].

It might be useful if somebody inquired about this and told us about the billions of rubles of people's money buried within these bunkers. This would not just provide us with more information, but could also enable us to find a way in which these well-built premises could be used for the good of the people.

It is, perhaps, worth explaining that I acquired these secret documents not with CIA assistance, but in a most simple Soviet manner. Once, I happened to be repairing my bicycle on the outskirts of the village of Poznyaky (Kiev). There was a huge heap of scraps of paper nearby. Among the burned paper, on which I wanted to wipe my hands, two thick files that were neatly tied caught my eye. When I untied them, I saw a series of official stamps, the seals "secret," "military unit", "Chernihiv Oblast KGB," "approved," "coordinated," and signatures. The signatures belonged to military and civilian officials.... The documents in the files were entitled [in Russian] "On the Construction of a Secret Facility in the Town of Chernigov."

The next day I made a phone call to the Chernihiv Oblast Party Committee and said that I wanted to transfer these documents to the KGB in Volodymyrska Street, Kiev. The answer was [in Russian]: "It would be ideal if you sent them to the first department of our party oblast committee." I did just that (at that time, I worked as head of the scientific board in charge of illustrations and cartography at the Main Editorial Board of the Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia). It was later explained to me that such documents were not thrown away but destroyed in the center. That time, some sloppy KGB official failed to fulfill his duty.

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Says Armed Forces Creation Likely

LD1602034992 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1923 GMT 15 Feb 92

[From the "Politics" section: "Kazakhstan is Likely To Create Its Own Armed Forces"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev speaks about the possibility of future formation of Republic's armed forces: Looks like we shall come to that. Having made this statement in his February 15 interview to the Kazakh TV on the results of the CIS heads of state Minsk conference, Nazarbayev emphasized that Kazakhstan has no plans of launching an offense against whomsoever.

According to Nazarbayev, while principles of CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] states interaction in military sphere were discussed, he asked questions of the Aviation Marshal Shaposhnikov: The military budget used to be top secret, we criticized the former Minister of Defense Yazov, so is it possible to review this secret today, so that we knew what we were going to pay for? What is the level of the Army retention? What is the program of conversion like and what is to be done to carry out conversion of defense enterprises? Why do we have to cheat those officers and service people who are to undergo reduction and what means shall we channel on their further employment, on providing them with housing, on their social security? The Armed Forces command does not have to take clear-cut answers to these questions. They said that these documents would be submitted in a month's time.

Sizing up the Minsk meeting results, Nazarbayev said: If I am pleased, it is only partially, I am much more displeased, because decisions taken by us at meetings of the heads of states are not supervised by any organ, they get suspended, they produce disappointment. Nazarbayev believes that it is necessary to create at least an assembly of 10-20 deputies of republican parliaments and organs of control. In Nazarbayev's words, the trade economic agreement signed in Minsk rules out the possibility of defining quotas, of licensing material and technical resources, opens up new vistas for normal trade, no market is possible without it.

Diplomatic Relations Established With Austria

LD1902184192 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1444 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Viktor Borodich and Yuriy Kozlov]

[Text] Vienna, Feb 19—Expansion of bilateral dialogue in economics, science, and technology and also the establishment of a financial basis for mutually beneficial cooperation were advocated today at a joint news conference held by Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev and Austrian Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitzky. They are holding talks as part of the official visit to Austria by Kazakhstan's head of state.

The agenda for the talks is headed by a wide range of issues linked to Austrian aid in developing Kazakhstan's economy, among other things by providing advice. In particular, Vranitzky announced, agreement has been reached to hold regular meetings between experts in various forms of cooperation and technical assistance. The Austrian side expressed its willingness to help Kazakhstan train specialists in management, taxation, and banking. The chancellor spoke in favor of rapid admission of the Republic of Kazakhstan to membership of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Nursultan Nazarbayev gave a detailed description of Kazakhstan's current economic situation and also set out the substance of the reforms underway to strengthen state independence. He said that the republic is forming its own gold reserve and has established a national bank to service foreign trade operations with foreign partners. On the subject of relations with the other members of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS], the president affirmed his support for consolidation of the Commonwealth and its creation of joint bodies to coordinate legislation and economic and financial matters.

Dwelling on the subject of nuclear weapons, Nursultan Nazarbayev reaffirmed Kazakhstan's commitment to international legal accords achieved in this field, and he also announced that the republic is willing to accede to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The former Soviet Union's strategic missiles, he added, will be under the single control and command of the four republics on whose territory they are located.

The Kazakhstan president voiced his concern over the growing influence of Islamic fundamentalism in the Asian regions of the former USSR, and advocated a search for shared approaches to solve this problem within a CIS framework, primarily between Russia and Kazakhstan.

It was announced at the news conference that Austria and Kazakhstan have agreed to establish diplomatic relations. The specifics of opening embassies in Alma-Ata and Vienna have yet to be decided. Nursultan Nazarbayev explained that Kazakhstan intends to dispatch its own envoy to the Austrian capital to perform diplomatic duties based at the former Soviet embassy, currently the Russian embassy in Austria. If necessary, the envoy will be awarded the rank of ambassador, the president added.

President's Envoy Meets With Japanese Leaders

PM1902114792 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 5

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Kazakhstan and Japan Want to Exchange Embassies"]

[Text] Judging by everything, Kazakhstan is continuing its diplomatic offensive in the Orient. This time it is Japan, where for the first time a delegation of parliamentary deputies and representatives of Kazakh social organizations is visiting. The delegation is headed by Anuar Alimzhanov, the president's special envoy.

An ITAR-TASS correspondent reports that A. Alimzhanov was received 20 February by Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa, to whom he gave messages from Kazakh President N. Nazarbayev and Prime Minister S. Tereshchenko. In particular, these contain an invitation to K. Miyazawa to visit Kazakhstan, and express the republic's interest in developing trade, economic, and cultural links with Japan in every possible way. As A. Alimzhanov stated at the press conference after the meeting, the Japanese prime minister also expressed a desire to develop contacts with Alma-Ata.

The Kazakh president's special envoy also met with Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe, who spoke of his intention to visit Kazakhstan this May. Both sides also expressed interest in exchanging diplomatic missions. However, as A. Alimzhanov stressed at a press conference, this is a difficult undertaking and will take a certain amount of time. He also expressed hope that the question would finally be resolved at a "Kazakh-Japanese summit, which is expected to happen."

Turning to the prospects for the conclusion of a peace treaty between Kazakhstan and Japan, A. Alimzhanov noted that Alma-Ata and Tokyo are currently just beginning their diplomatic dialogue, and the question of the signing of such a document is not yet on the agenda.

Briefs Media on Talks

LD1602032692 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 13 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo, 13 Feb (TASS)—An invitation for the head of the Japanese Government to visit Kazakhstan is contained in the message from President Nursultan Nazarbayev which was handed over today to Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa by the Kazakh president's special envoy, Anuar Alimzhanov.

At a news conference which took place on the same day, the head of the first Kazakh diplomatic mission to Japan—in which parliament deputies and public figures of this former Soviet republic are represented—noted that the message sent by the president of the young Kazakh state expresses gratitude to Japan for being one of the first countries to recognize the sovereignty of Kazakhstan. Answering a question from the ITAR-TASS correspondent, Anuar Alimzhanov said that the messages sent by President Nazarbayev and Kazakh Prime Minister Tereshchenko, which were also handed over to the prime minister of Japan, pointed out the Republic's interest in the general development of cultural, trade, and economic ties with Japan.

Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa expressed interest in developing contacts with Kazakhstan during his meeting with the special envoy of the Republic's president. A. Alimzhanov also noted that during their meeting yesterday, Japanese Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe declared his intention to visit Kazakhstan in May 1992. In the course of negotiations between the Kazakh representative and Michio Watanabe, both sides also declared their interest in opening diplomatic missions in both countries respectively. "I hope this question will be finally decided at the Kazakh-Japanese summit," said A. Alimzhanov, "but this is not a simple matter: As is known, all the property of the former USSR abroad, including embassies, belongs to Russia, and this problem will probably be discussed at the meeting of the CIS member states' leaders, which opens in Minsk tomorrow."

Talking about the prospects for concluding a peace treaty between Kazakhstan and Japan, he noted that Alma-Ata and Tokyo have only just begun their diplomatic dialogue, and the question of concluding such a document is not on the agenda yet. Anuar Alimzhanov also stressed the importance of the forthcoming official setting up of the association for Japanese-Kazakh cooperation in the cultural and economic spheres, planned for 17 February, in broadening the dialogue between Kazakhstan and Japan. "Until now, we were given only a Western orientation," noted the special envoy of the Kazakh president, "but we belong to Asia, which begins with Japan and ends with our Republic. We would now like to turn our face toward the East."

Answering journalists' questions on Kazakhstan's attitude toward the territorial problem existing between Russia and Japan, A. Alimjanov stated that Alma-Ata "understands Tokyo's position on this issue." Kazakhstan thinks that historical justice should prevail and that this problem should be decided on the basis of legitimacy, said the republic's presidential envoy. "Of course, resolving this problem is a matter for Russia, and we are only talking about our readiness to assist in accelerating a solution to the territorial question."

Commission Recommends Joint Command of Baykonyr

LD1802104192 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] A special commission set up by the Kazakh Government has worked out a draft agreement according to which the Baykonyr cosmodrome in Kazakhstan is to come under the control of the strategic command of the Commonwealth of Independent States and be financed jointly by the Commonwealth member-countries. The share of each republic will be determined by the degree of its interest in space research.

Impact of Major Price Increases Detailed

PM2002102992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Oleg Stefashin: "You Cannot Buy a Sheep—Now It Bites"]

[Text] After the rise in prices in Kazakhstan, it is only the miners' wages which have increased very tangibly—they now receive at least 4,000 rubles [R].

It is already perfectly obvious that what has happened in Kazakhstan is what the republican government most feared when it was obliged to release prices at what was stated to be the most inappropriate moment. About 80 percent of the population has in fact found itself below the poverty line. Depending on the grade one kilogram of meat costs R190-230 while butter costs R140 and smetana R60. For a republic where just two months ago it was possible to buy a sheep for R60 and a horse for R1,000, this rise in prices could be called inconceivable. The consumer basket immediately increased to R1,200-R1,300 and that was a complete surprise to those, including the Cabinet of Ministers, who supposed that the minimum living wage after liberalization would scarcely exceed R460.

The excessive rise in the cost of living, whatever the reasons for it, has generated a storm of indignation in Kazakhstan. The Karaganda miners went on strike for a week, demanding a wage increase. Drivers and teachers held protest actions. With every passing day the situation has been heated and obliged the government hastily to seek a way out of the situation.

In the end it was found, as Kazakhstan President N. Nazarbayev has announced, stating in a speech that free prices cannot be infinitely high.

Of course it is too early to say how prices policy will develop in Kazakhstan. So far one thing is undoubted: By his decree on additional measures for the population's social protection, N. Nazarbayev has established for the first quarter state regulated prices initially for bread and bakery and dairy products and later for meat. Now one kilogram of beef costs R54 in the Karaganda stores, one kilogram of pork costs R50, poultry and duck R37-40, pasta R22-24, cooked sausage from R81, butter R54, prepacked smetana R9, eggs cost R16 for 10, and a bottle of kefir R3.84, including the bottle.

It is easy to note that although prices have descended from their stratospheric heights they have still not become accessible to a considerable proportion of the population. The exception is the miners, who have achieved from the government an increase in minimum wage rates for surface workers to R4,000 and to R7,000 for tunnelers.

It is true that in December the republic's Cabinet of Ministers increased by 90 percent the wages of workers in organizations and departments funded from the state budget. But since January their wages have been simply miserly. For teachers and cultural workers it is now R650, for doctors R710. In the very near future, the government has stated, there is no point in even thinking of improving the material position of employees in these categories—such a hole has formed in the republic's budget that to all appearances the implementation of a whole series of very important social programs will soon have to be abandoned.

There is no doubt that one can understand the government which just to subsidize the dairy and bread sectors urgently had to find an additional R7 billion and is now having to cudgel its brains over where to find the same sum to make good the expenses connected with restricting prices for meat. Yet we should also probably sympathize with the millions of people whose income is two to three times below the living wage.

The cheapest refrigerators in the state trading network now cost R1,700 while washing machines produced in Alma-Ata cost R1,500, color television sets cost R3,000-R4,000, and unattractive women's dresses cost R800. Actually it turns out that even these prices will not remain as they are for long.

V. Kandaurov, director of the "Elektrobytpribor" plant, said that the enterprise cannot be rebuked for that. The new system of taxation so oppresses the producer now that there is nothing left for him to do but either to wind up production completely or to increase prices, running the risk of failing to find a demand for his output.

There is no doubt that the goods which have appeared for sale at such high prices by no means encourage people to make purchases. In the first 20 days of January all the Karaganda stores managed to sell 1.5 tonnes of meat. There are virtually no sales of sausages, prices for which are as yet not being reduced. The meat combines are in despair—they are having to stop their production lines and cut back on production.

In the government's opinion the situation, especially on the food market, could be seriously complicated. As one rescue measure N. Nazarbayev has adopted a decision on transferring 10 percent of stores to the collective and state farms and to the processing enterprises for their own trade. But it is becoming increasingly obvious that such attempts to save the economy will produce little, since they are geared primarily toward preserving the old state structures and not supporting private or collective owners.

Kyrgyzstan

Government To Follow Independent Military Policy

OW2002122492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1105 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kyrgyzstan intends to work out its own military policy and defend its right to form its own army and

withdraw from the CIS armed forces. But for the time being the republic "contemplates no secession", Janybek Umetaliyev, chairman of Kyrgyzstan's Defence Affairs Committee, told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent in comments on the CIS summit held in Minsk. Umetaliyev believes that the lack of coincidence in the CIS countries' fundamental approaches to the development of armed forces should not be dramatized. The sooner the republics define their attitudes to these issues, the faster the endeavors to build a mechanism for constructive relationships will progress, he said.

President Meets With Swiss Counterpart in Bern

LD1402223492 Moscow TASS in English
1859 GMT 14 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Shabayev]

[Text] Bern February 14 TASS—Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev, currently on a working visit to Switzerland, today met his Swiss counterpart Rene Felber to discuss bilateral political, economic and humanitarian cooperation.

The sides agreed on the establishment of diplomatic relations between Kyrgyzstan and Switzerland.

Felber expressed the Swiss readiness to bilateral cooperation and noted his country values the fact Kyrgyzstan preserves civil peace and interethnic concord.

Askar Akayev told ITAR-TASS Kyrgyz special interest in Switzerland is understandable, since Kyrgyzstan is named Switzerland of Central Asia because of its natural conditions and the location on a crossroads of ancient routes. Akayev said during his meeting with the Swiss president they focused on comprehensive consolidation of bilateral relations.

Says CIS 'Absolutely Necessary'

LD1302222892 Moscow TASS in English
2144 GMT 13 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS Correspondent Boris Shabayev]

[Text] Geneva February 14 TASS—"There is at least one dimension in which our Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] is absolutely necessary, namely, the human dimension," President Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan, who is in Switzerland on a working visit, told ITAR-TASS on Thursday.

"However much we deny our past," he emphasised, "the peoples of the former Soviet Union did maintain genuine friendship and our hearts were open to one another. We are brought together by billions of threads which are impossible to break."

"At present, the CIS is taking an examination of survival and of existence in the long term," the president of Kyrgyzstan said. "We all are to prove its objective necessity and usefulness for the peoples of independent states. A kind of centrifugal process is now under way throughout the territory of the former Soviet Union and everyone tries to independently solve the task of surviving in the newly established conditions."

"This is a natural process and the current situation should not be dramatised. Similar processes take place in nature as well: galaxies scatter until some moment when gravitational forces come to prevail over repelling forces. At present, apparently, we are objectively in need of becoming aware of and understanding our role and then seek and establish new contacts that will bring us together.

"It is precisely from the viewpoint of the human dimension that the new Commonwealth is absolutely essential for us. It should be preserved. We must have contacts without customs and any other barriers. We all need this. Therefore, I take an optimistic view of the prospects of our Commonwealth.

"In this capacity it should both live on and grow stronger. The human factor will become the center of crystallisation, through which we shall be able to integrate everything else. The new Commonwealth is also essential as a factor of political stability on the one-sixth of the globe, as a factor of world peace and security," the president of Kyrgyzstan said.

Ends Visit

LD1502230992 Moscow TASS in English
2107 GMT 15 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Shabayev]

[Text] Geneva February 15 TASS [as received]—A working visit of Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev to Switzerland has come to a close. He had a conversation with President of the Swiss Confederation Rene Felber in Berne, at which they reached agreement on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. The two presidents also discussed issues dealing with political, economic and cultural cooperation.

The Kyrgyz president was the first of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] heads of state who visited the headquarters of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in Geneva. He had a meeting with Director General of the International Labour Office [as received] Michel Ansen, with whom he discussed in detail the main spheres in which ILO may render effective practical assistance to Kyrgyzstan in the creation of the structure of social and labour relations, corresponding to the period of transition to a market-based economy. Askar Akayev told ITAR-TASS that he attached special importance to cooperation with ILO, because the settlement of social and labour problems is of crucial importance for the success of the reform implemented in the republic.

President Signs Diplomatic Accord in Ottawa

LD1802111692 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0011 GMT 18 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets]

[Text] Ottawa, 18 Feb (TASS)—Monday [17 February] Kyrgyzstan President Askar Akayev paid a one-day visit to Ottawa during which an agreement was reached on establishing diplomatic relations between the two countries. A joint declaration was signed which stresses the intention of both governments to develop ties between the peoples of Canada and of Kyrgyzstan. The president had a conversation with Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, the main subject of which was questions of bilateral relations. As reported by Askar Akayev in a brief interview to an ITAR-TASS correspondent, the talk was about cooperation in the political, economic, and humanitarian spheres. Askar Akayev said: I have come here with proposals which in our view may also interest Canada. In particular, the problems of creating joint enterprises in the mining industry and in agriculture were considered.

At the ceremony of signing the joint declaration, Barbara McDougall, secretary of state for external affairs, said "Kyrgyzstan has shown itself to be a democratic voice of stability in the new post-Soviet era." Ottawa is counting on developing close economic, social, and diplomatic ties with the new independent state. In the words of McDougall, the president did not address requests about giving concrete financial or economic assistance. But, Canada is ready to give assistance in the development of democratic institutions and a market economy.

The president also met with the foreign trade minister, the state minister for matters of national cultures, and the leader of the opposition in parliament, and visited a scientific agricultural center in Ottawa.

After completing the working visit, Askar Akayev left on a private trip to Toronto where on 19 and 20 February he will meet with representatives of the business community.

Armenia

Official Denies Forces Massing on Border

LD1902133992 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] According to a report by the SNARK agency, Ashot Manucharyan, chief adviser to the Armenian president, has denied the assertions by a number of Azerbaijani mass media that Armenian defense forces allegedly crossed the Armenian-Azerbaijani border on 17 February. Manucharyan also described the information about the massing of Armenian armed formations near several Azerbaijani towns of strategic importance as false.

Spokesman Answers Turkish Leader's Remarks

LD1902222792 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan February 19 TASS—Armenia is bewildered with the Turkish Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel's statement saying his country will not remain indifferent in case a war breaks out in the Transcaucasian district.

Similar statements contradict generally recognized principles of international law and can be considered only a gross intervention in the internal affairs of the countries neighbouring Turkey, the Armenian president's press service representative told ITAR-TASS. Besides, according to the same representative, statements made by Demirel in the course of his visit to the U.S., later quoted by AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE, do not contribute to the stabilization of the situation in the Transcaucasian district, on which the Commonwealth countries and authoritative organizations are centering their efforts now.

It seems strange that such statements were made by Turkey, which repeatedly expressed its readiness to mediate in the settlement of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations and whose interest in establishing peace in the Trans-Caucasian district is understandable and natural, the spokesman for the Armenian president stressed.

According to him, it is also strange that the world community's concern over elementary human rights in Nagorno-Karabakh is presented as Western support for Armenia. Meanwhile, it is the duty of any civilized state, including Turkey, to create effective mechanisms which guarantee normal vital functions and security of the peaceful population suffering from many years of violence.

Nagorno-Karabakh Proposals Presented to CSCE

NC1902184192 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] President Levon Ter-Petrosyan received on 18 February the members of the CSCE's fact-finding commission, which in keeping with an agreement reached in Prague had been sent on a fact-finding mission to the Caucasus, Armenia, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Azerbaijan to draw up a report.

After introducing the members of the commission and conveying their impressions of the visit to Nagorno-Karabakh, Schwarzenberg, head of the chancellery of Czechoslovakia and chairman of the fact- finding commission, asked Ter-Petrosyan to clarify the Armenian authorities' position on the possibility of a peaceful resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh problem.

In briefly recounting the history of Nagorno-Karabakh, Levon Ter- Petrosyan noted that the meaningless efforts to delve into history and search for culprits will at present produce no result. Instead it is necessary to mobilize efforts in view of the existing situation, which demands the prevention of further bloodshed. Normal living conditions for the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh. [sentence as received] Armenia's past initiatives to solve the emerging problems through political means regrettably have remained unanswered.

The president presented to the commission a new package of proposals for mutual concessions, indicating that these proposals could be examined during future bilateral or multilateral talks. The cease-fire and the creation of an effective system for the protection of the population was singled out from among these proposals. That will be followed by talks with Azerbaijan with the mediation and participation of the Commonwealth of Independent States or international organizations. In these talks Armenia should not be an active participant, for it can only limitedly contribute to the implementation of the agreements to be reached and, besides, it favors any solution which satisfies the population of Nagorno-Karabakh. Next, it is necessary to implement practical measures to ensure sufficient conditions for the basic survival of the population.

President Levon Ter-Petrosyan rejected attempts by political circles and certain media to the present Nagorno-Karabakh problem as a territorial demand against Azerbaijan or as an ethnic antagonism or religious clash. He emphasized that the issue should be assessed solely from the viewpoint of a nation's right to self-determination.

In expressing thanks for the detailed information and replies to many questions, Schwarzenberg said that the CSCE fact-finding commission is preparing serious conclusions and hoped that it soon will be possible to stabilize the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Armenian Foreign Minister Raffi Ovannisyan, Armenian presidential adviser Vahan Papazyan, and other officials were present at the meeting.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Babken Araktsyan also had a meeting with the CSCE commission on the same day.

Azerbaijan

State of Emergency Introduced in Two Rayons

LD1902181992 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1710 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Ziyadkhan Gasanov]

[Text] Baku, 19 Feb (TASS)—By decree of the president of the Republic of Azerbaijan, a state of emergency has been introduced in the Agdamskiy and Shushinskiy rayons of Azerbaijan for two months.

The decree was approved at a sitting of the National Council of the republican Supreme Soviet today. The state of emergency, the decree says, is being introduced "in order to ensure safety for the citizens residing in the Agdamskiy and Shushinskiy rayons of Azerbaijan, taking into account the real threat to their lives caused by the unprecedentedly large-scale combat actions by Armenian military formations." Relevant instructions were also given to the Ministries of Internal Affairs and Defense of the Republic.

In connection with the proclamation of a state of emergency in Agdamskiy and Shushinskiy rayons, members of the National Council have sent a letter to UN Secretary General Butrus Ghali, in which they set out the reasons for introducing the state of emergency.

Foreign Ministry Sends Protest Note to Armenia

LD2002090292 Moscow TASS in English 0833 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By AZERINFORM correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku February 20 TASS—In conjunction with the escalation of military operations both on the border with Armenia and in the highland part of Nagorno-Karabakh, Azerbaijan's Foreign Ministry sent a protest note to Armenia's Foreign Ministry, in which the recent developments are described as the increase in the scope of the undeclared war against Azerbaijan.

The AZERINFORM correspondent was told today the Azerbaijani Foreign Ministry sent reports to embassies of several states in Moscow, the U.N. Information Centre, the U.N. International Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the foreign ministries of the Commonwealth member-states about the facts of the violation by Armenian armed groups of Azerbaijan's state border, seizing villages, killing civilians and torturing hostages.

CIS Troops Accused of Siding With Armenians

LD1902034992 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Report by M. Mamedov from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] We found our way to Shusha via mountain passes, on the only road linking this besieged town with Azerbaijan. On arrival we had to hide in a cellar because another bombardment had started. Local inhabitants have to spend most of the day in these unusual shelters now.

The Armenian guerrillas' artillery is systematically destroying Shusha, one of the last major populated areas of the Azerbaijani community. The continuous bombardments are aimed at sowing panic and making Shusha residents and the town's defenders leave it, since an attempt at storming Shusha would certainly result in great losses for Armanian formations. For the time being, according to specialists' estimations, they retain a certain advantage. It is obvious now that Armenia, which is waging war in Nagorno-Karabakh, prepared for this in advance. The guerrillas have much greater numbers of heavy artillery equipment and armored vehicles. Some of this has been offered by the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] motorized rifle regiment stationed in Khankendi [Stepanakert].

There is much proof of the fact that both the hardware and servicemen of this CIS formation have taken part in attacks on Azerbaijani villages and towns, said Rakhim Kaziyev, member of the Azerbaijan parliament and commander of the Shusha defense. What are these soldiers doing there? What important strategic site are they protecting there? We believe that Marshal Shaposhnikov is using this regiment as a means of bringing pressure to bear upon independent Azerbaijan.

Report Denied

NC1902102092 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] Chairman of Nagorno-Karabakh Republic Supreme Soviet Artur Mkrtchyan refuted Azerbaijani claims that the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Army regiment in Stepanakert is taking part in the combat operations on the side of the Armenians. In Mkrtchyan's opinion the uproar over the regiment is intended to force it out of Stepanakert. At present, he said, the regiment is "the sole guarantee of the city's security."

'Evidence' Backs Charge

OW1902195492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1902 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At a news conference in Baku February 19 Rasim Agayev, press secretary of Azerbaijan's president, denied

a statement by Commander of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Armed Forces Marshal Shaposhnikov that military units subordinated to him are not involved in ethnic military conflicts. Agayev said the Azeri side has evidence that 366 servicemen of the 366th motorized infantry regiment stationed in Khankendi (the Azeri name of Stepanakert) have participated in military actions against Azeri civilians. Agayev stated that "the policy of the CIS Military Command in relation to Azerbaijan represents a revenge for the republic's independent policy".

As INTERFAX learned at the Azeri presidential press service, since February 19 morning the town of Shusha in Nagorno-Karabakh (populated predominantly by Azeris) has been heavily shelled by long-range artillery from the direction of Khankendi and the village of Topkhana. The village of Khodzhaly has been all day long under intense fire. A lot of technical military equipment, including that of the 366th motorized infantry regiment, has been drawn to Khodzhaly.

Heavy fire has been waged from the direction of the villages of Mekhti-Abat and Naragiul controlled by Armenian armed units. There have been casualties, but their number has not yet been determined due to poor communication, the Azeri presidential press service says.

The Azeri side reports that during an attack by Armenian units on a military station in the Kubatlinskiy region, 15 Azeris were taken hostage. Armenian armed units offer to exchange the hostages for Russian soldiers who have deserted from military units stationed in Khankendi.

Commander Seeks Probe

LD1602113992 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0006 GMT 16 Feb 92

[Excerpt] Moscow, 16 Feb (ITAR-TASS)—[passage omitted] A Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] general staff duty officer telephoned ITAR-TASS nighttime news service to report that Major General Nikolay Popov, the commanding officer of the Army stationed on Azerbaijani territory, contacted him at approximately 2200 [1900 GMT] to say that the report on a case of military actions by a motorized infantry regiment in the Stepanakert (Khankendi) region broadcast on the first channel evening television news is untrue. Such television statements are seen at ground level as another attempt to discredit the Armed Forces among the civilian population and to exacerbate interethnic relations, as well as the situation around military units. Nikolay Popov also said that the 11 servicemen who were declared dead are, in fact, deserters from the Stepanakert (Khankendi) town garrison. They are all alive. Three of them are in Stepanakert (Khankendi) itself, two in Gyandzha, and six in Agdam. The Army commander said that he insists on an investigation into the broadcast of false and unverified information.

Leader Claims West Sending Arms to Armenia

NC1902140292 Istanbul TURKIYE in Turkish 11 Feb 92 p 13

[Report by Murat Yesil and Murat Arvas]

[Text] The Armenian bandits are continuing their fierce attacks on Turkish villages in Azerbaijan's mountainous Karabakh region, where 60 Turks were massacred in the past two days. Earlier, there was a burial ceremony for 100 Turks massacred by Armenian bandits.

Azerbaijan People's Front Leader Ebulfez Elcibey [Ebulfez Aliyev] told our reporter in Baku that "the Nagorno-Karabakh problem stems from the policies pursued by the Armenian and Azerbaijani leaderships." He added: "The United States, Russia, ASALA [Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia], the Armenian diaspora lobby, and even Iran are meddling in Nagorno-Karabakh."

CSCE Delegation Is Going There

The Armenian bandits shut down Agdam's airport using modern weapons, the source of which is not certain. After knocking out the airport, the Armenian bandits massacred another 100 Turks in this city.

It is reported that the armed gangs have surrounded Agdam and Shusha and have occupied Kirkidzhan and Khodzhali. Some 36 Azerbaijanis who were defending the cities were killed yesterday.

The CSCE delegation, which left for Nagorno-Karabakh to investigate the massacres perpetrated by the Armenians there, is said to be trying to reach the region.

Turkey's consul in Baku, Mehmet Ali Bayar, said in a statement: "The CSCE is sending a five-member delegation to Nagorno-Karabakh on Turkey's initiative. There are representatives from the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, and Norway in the CSCE fact-finding group operating under the Czechoslovakian Foreign Ministry. There were intensive consultations to include a Turkish representative, which Azerbaijan also requested, but the CSCE preferred to send observers from other countries rather than from those countries which directly or indirectly are sides to the dispute."

Azerbaijani Prime Minister Gasan Gasanov said they have now ascertained that the Armenian terror gang ASALA is committing crimes in Nagorno-Karabakh, using super weapons to do so. Gasanov said: "The situation in the region is very tense. The Armenian diaspora is still active. The U.S. and French airplanes, which brought relief assistance following the earthquake in Armenia, also brought ample weapons under the guise of relief. A ship from Syria which was bringing arms to Armenia was impounded on the way."

Elcibey: "This Regime Must Go"

The leader of the Azerbaijan People's Front told our paper: "This unrepresentative government and parliament must go and they should be replaced by the people's real representatives. Russian imperialism continues in Azerbaijan and the KGB is still active. The Army is a Russian one and the currency is still Russian. Yet we call this independence."

He added that Azerbaijan will attain real independence and democracy when the front comes to power.

Gasanov Addresses European Parliament Commission

LD1902212292 Moscow TASS in English 0950 GMT 19 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Text] Brussels February 19 TASS—Azerbaijan is prepared to construct its relations with all countries without any exception on the principles of peaceful co-existence, goodneighbourliness, respect for each other's sovereignty and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, Prime Minister of Azerbaijan Gasan Gasanov, who is on a working visit to Belgium, said on Tuesday [18 February] in his address to the European Parliament's International Affairs and Security Commission, elaborating the main principles of his country's state policy.

Our vision of a future model of the Azeri society ensures from its historical experience and geopolitical location of the republic situated on the junction of the east, the west, the north, and the south, he said.

The prime minister emphasised, Azerbaijan considers it necessary to participate in all-European peace and security process. The country has become a fullfledged member of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) with the strong conviction that only observation of commitments within the framework of this forum can serve as a basis and guarantee for future stability and well-being in Europe.

Speaking on its relations with republics of the former Soviet Union, Gasanov said it is important to develop them.

Speaking of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, the head of the government emphasised that an undeclared war is going on on the Azeri territory and attempts are being made to tear apart a part of its territory by force of arms. In accordance with international norms, we will use our legal right to defend our territorial integrity in case the other side refuses to put an end to armed actions and find a political solution, he said.

While supporting a peaceful solution to the conflict, Azerbaijan welcomes help of the international community in solving it, Gasanov said. It can be done in the form of an authoratative international commission in support of the peaceful process, in providing information on what is going on in Nagorno-Karabakh and humanitarian and expert aid, the Azeri premier said.

Nagorno-Karabakh Leader Supports Peace Talks

LD1802235992 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2210 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] Moscow, 19 Feb (ITAR-TASS)—Talks on Nagorno-Karabakh without Nagorno-Karabakh are unproductive, believes Artur Mkrtchyan, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Republic Supreme Soviet. "We have never been opposed to talks, but they do not seem to suit the leaders of Azerbaijan," he said in an interview published today in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA.

According to the leader of the Nagorno-Karabakh parliament, the leadership of Azerbaijan is waging outright war against the Armenian people. "We have always favored political dialogue," he said.

Nonetheless, Artur Mkrtchyan believes, talks would be possible if the Azerbaijanis had a cease-fire in the region, withdrew their armed formations from Nagorno-Karabakh, and lifted their blockade of the area. The Azerbaijani leadership would thereby acknowledge the right of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh to live on their own land. "The present actions of the Azerbaijani side show that they are denying us that right," he noted.

According to the Nagorno-Karabakh leader, the existence of an independent Nagorno-Karabakh Republic is already a "fait accomli." "We have always stressed," he said, "that events in the region do not so much concern Armenia and Azerbaijan as Nagorno-Karabakh and Azerbaijan. Today, any talks in the region in which Nagorno-Karabakh does not take direct part are not serious."

At the same time, Major General Ilguseyn Ogly Guseynov, Azerbaijani minister for national security, has stated in an interview in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA that Azerbaijan will never give up its own territories. "We will create a regular army and the entire territory of Nagorno-Karabakh will be liberated," he said.

Nagorno-Karabakh Ministers Criticize Attacks

LD1902005192 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English 1526 GMT 18 Feb 92

[From the "Politics" section]

[Text] Stepanakert—A February 18 statement by Nagorno-Karabakh Council of Ministers expresses concern over frequented attacks on Army units.

The statement cites the following figures: 23 attacks on Army units in 1992 as against 43 for the whole 1991, 15 assaults on servicemen as compared to 28 for 1991, 3 persons were killed as against 8 for 1991. On February 13 as a result of an offense on anti-aircraft defenses' sub-unit, 2 combat helicopters with a set of 2,805 shells,

including 457 Nurs 5K shells were detained. The statement points out that Azerbaijan army, that is under formation, is being equipped with modern combat machinery, withdrawn from the armed forces of the former union and this cannot but cause anxiety of the Nagorno-Karabakh government. The authors of the statement are worried that the updated armaments will be used alongside tanks, armored personnel carriers, grad-type units against Nagorno-Karabakh people.

The Nagorno-Karabakh Council of Ministers, the statement says, addresses to the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] heads of state, above all of the Russian Federation, with the demand to display all their influence and undertake urgent measures concerning unlawful seizure of mass destruction weapons by the Azerbaijanian side. The lack of any reaction on the part of the CIS member-states encourages Azerbaijan's aggressive actions and makes them responsible for the tragic consequences, the statement says.

Soldiers Banned From Carrying Weapons in Baku

LD1802044692 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0400 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] According to the RIKA news agency, Azerbaijan's Defense Ministry has banned servicemen from carrying weapons in Baku. The decision was made because of the worsening tribal situation as a result of the appearance in the streets of armed persons passing themselves off as servicemen.

Authorities Detain 4 Russian Deserters

OW1902202392 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1902 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The press center of the president of Azerbaijan told INTERFAX that Azeri law enforcement forces have detained four Russian servicemen—a sergeant and 3 soldiers, who deserted from the 366 regiment deployed in Stepanakert (Khankendi). According to a member of the press center the soldiers stated that they were among 120 servicemen who were transferred to Nagorno-Karabakh from Nakhichevan at the order of the Transcausasian military district which "deceived us by telling us we were being sent on business to Gyandzha" (Azerbaijan).

The press center of the President of Azerbaijan confirmed the report that soldiers and military technicians from the Stepanakert regiment under the command of an Armenian officer had participated in the seizure of the Azeri villages of Malybeyli and Karadagly February 11 and 17.

In addition, the "SNARK" agency reports that the adviser to the Armenian President on national security Ashot Manucharvan officially rejected the assertion by a number of Azeri news agencies that Armenian military formations crossed the Armenian-Azeri border February 17 and conducted military operations in the neighboring republic.

Mutalibov Removes Defense Minister From Post

LD1802160292 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] By decree of Azerbaijan President Ayaz Mutalibov, Major General Mekhtiyev has been released from his duties as the Republic's minister of defense. Major General Musayev has been appointed acting defense minister. Mekhtiyev's removal is being connected with the lack of success of the Azerbaijani national army in combat actions in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Georgia

Russian Explanation on 'Volunteers' Demanded

OW1902163492 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1410 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Foreign Ministry of Georgia has demanded that the Russian Foreign Ministry explain the sending of volunteers from the Russian Federation to South Ossetia.

The ministry issued a statement on Wednesday [19 February] describing actions of this kind as capable of causing an escalation of warfare in the region.

The 10 Russian volunteers, belonging to the Russian Legion whose formation had been authorized by the recent Congress of Civil and Patriotic Forces in Moscow, arrived in Tskhinval late last week—allegedly to help out the Ossetians.

South Ossetia Remains 'Relatively Stable'

LD2002104192 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 20 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz February 20 TASS—The past 24 hours have not introduced substantial changes to the relatively stable situation in South Ossetia. According to the republic's Ministry of the Interior, several local foci of confrontration between the conflicting sides were observed on the far approaches to Tskhinval.

It became known from sources close to the Supreme Council of the South Ossetian Republic that it formed a commission to hold talks with plenipotentiary representatives of the provisional government of Georgia with a view to ending the armed conflict and settling Ossetian-Georgian relations.

There is hope in South Ossetia that Russia should become "a third party" in the dialogue because the

stability of the situation on the southern borders of the Russian Federation depends on the outcome of the talks.

Economic problems and the lack of provision of vital supplies are still keenly felt in South Ossetia. The contact with Tskhinval is maintained only by means of helicopters.

The news organisations of North Ossetia today circulated the text of a North Ossetian parliament resolution extending the duration of the state-of-emergency regime on the territory of Prigorodny district and in the city of Vladikavkaz in view of a tense socio-political situation on the border between North Ossetia and Ingushetia.

Gamsakhurdia Said To Return 'Today or Tomorrow'

LD2002040492 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0346 GMT 20 Feb 92

[Text] According to available reports, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, who is in Chechnya, will leave that republic today or tomorrow and return to Georgia. He held talks with Dzhokhar Dudayev yesterday.

Teachers, Students Protest

AU2002111592 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0300 GMT 20 Feb

[Text] Acts of civil disobedience are again continuing in Sukhumi. Yesterday a rally in support of Zviad Gamsakhurdia was held in Constitution Square.

Georgian teachers are on strike who are demanding the return of the former president to Georgia. Workers from certain Armenian schools in Abkhazia are participating in this action. Studies are continuing at Abkhazian and Russian secondary schools and higher educational institutions.

A group of students and pupils are now in the second day of a sit-down strike at the Konstantin Gamsakhurdia Georgian Drama Theater.

Guard Withdraws From Abkhazia; Bridge Blown Up

LD2002023192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya Ostankino Television First Program Network in Russian 2100 GMT 19 Feb 92

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer Mikhail Osokin] Contradictory reports are coming in from Georgia, where national guard units that restored normal operations at the rail junction and the Sukhumi airport have left Abkhazia.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent M. Shavgulidze] Two days ago, T. Kitovani, a member of the Military Council, gave an interview in which he noted that the withdrawal of guardsmen from Abkhazia is premature, but it is needed to guard important national economic facilities.

[Kitovani] For the moment we do not consider it possible. For the moment things are being put in order with regard to communications and deliveries. Cargo that is waiting in Krasnodar Oblast cannot reach us.

[Shavgulidze] In the wake of the accelerated withdrawal of the guardsmen from Abkhazia, which was insisted upon by the Abkhaz side, the rail bridge near Sukhumi was blown up, which naturally immediately affected the Transcaucasian railroad.

[I. Melkadze, first deputy head of the Transcaucasian railroad] Traffic on the main track was interrupted for 22 hours. The bridge support was blown up. Only through the heroic efforts of the railroad employees—perhaps this sounds banal—was train traffic restored. [end recording]

Estonia

Prime Minister Vahi Seeks New Elections Soon

PM1402121292 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 13 Feb 92 p 4

[Report on interview with Estonian Prime Minister Tiit Vahi by TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA correspondent Maritta Nystrom in Tallinn on 12 February]

[Text] Tallinn—The most important task facing Estonia's new government is to guarantee its citizens' basic welfare, such as a warm home and food, Estonia's new prime minister, Tiit Vahi, told TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA on Wednesday, 12 February.

Vahi pointed out that in the present difficult situation the government must see to it that the position of people on low incomes is safeguarded.

Immediately after becoming prime minister, Vahi broke with predecessor Edgar Savisaar's economic policy by lifting the state of economic emergency which was introduced in January. The Estonian parliament approved the new government's proposal on 11 February.

"The economic situation is extremely serious but it will not be resolved by a state of emergency or additional powers," Vahi said, adding that the economic problems should be solved through sound cooperation between government and parliament.

Vahi, who was transport minister in Savisaar's government, said several times that the present government does not intend to remain in office for long.

"Our political goal is to arrange new parliamentary elections quickly, for the situation in Estonia has changed a great deal since the last election," Vahi said. He hopes that this spring the parliament will reach a decision for new elections. He also views reinforcing Estonia's newfound democracy as an important task.

"The fact that the government was replaced democratically after six months of independence is proof of democracy in Estonia," Vahi pointed out, giving assurances that his government will hand over power if it does not win the support of the people in the election.

Vahi's government inherited the difficult question of who is to have Estonian citizenship from the previous government. On 11 February the Estonian government put a bill before parliament proposing that the 1938 citizenship law should come into force again, Vahi said.

However, the bill contains several alternatives which will be discussed by the parliament next week. It remains to be seen whether having lived in independent Estonia for two years will be sufficient to qualify for citizenship, as the most moderate politicians have proposed.

However, it is likely that the voice of the Russian minority in Estonia will not be heard in the parliamentary elections.

Vahi Shares Opinion of Russian 'Blockade'

PM1902165492 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by Leonid Levitskiy: "Private Business Knows No Bounds"]

[Text] Tallinn—The Estonian prime minister agrees with the Latvian premier's assessment of Russia's actions.

Readers of IZVESTIYA will be familiar with the statement by the Latvian Government head that Russia has resorted to an economic blockade. This opinion is shared by Tiit Vahi, the new Estonian prime minister. He set out his arguments in an interview for the paper ESTONIYA [as transliterated].

"There is an economic treaty with Russia. But we have not had a drop of gasoline for six weeks. It has introduced licenses and quotas for exports of commodities, but it is practically impossible to obtain the requisite permission.

"Estonia is in the grip of a fuel crisis and the raw material crisis is getting worse too. But it is effectively only state enterprises that are coming to a halt for want of raw materials. The blockade mentioned by Tiit Vahi has had little effect on private business. Russian customs are either open or half-open to it: Everything is getting through—gasoline, metals, and timber. State officials are far less enterprising."

Supreme Council Deliberations Reported

New Central Faction Formed

LD1402234892 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1500 GMT 13 Feb 92

[Summary] The former popular central faction within the Supreme Council modified itself into the central faction today and elected Edgar Savisaar as its leader. The faction has about 20 members.

Russian Democrats' Charter Refused

OW1402151892 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1401 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] After an hour and a half of debates February 13 the Presidium of the Estonian Supreme Council refused to register the Charter of the Russian Democratic Movement of Estonia [RDME]. It was decided to subject the Movement's documents to further examination.

Leader of the RDME Council Aleksandr Plyushayev told BF that experts who took part in the debates were criticizing the Movement's program, not the Charter.

The RDME was set up in the wake of the August coup attempt. It unites people protecting the interests of the Russian-speaking population of Estonia. Among its members are also supporters of the former Estonia's Intermovement.

The RDME applied for registration November 6. Under the law, an organization should be registered within two months after the application was made.

New Draft of Constitution Submitted

OW1802143792 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1325 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On February 18 Tinu Anton, Chairman of the Estonian Constitutional Assembly who was engaged in preparation of a new draft Constitution, submitted the draft to the Estonian parliament. In compliance with the decision of the Constitutional Assembly, the draft Constitution will also be submitted to the Estonian Congress uniting people having Estonian citizens before 1940 and their descendants. After the draft is considered in parliament and in congress, it will be offered for a referendum.

Finnish Prime Minister's Visit Reported

LD1602092692 Helsinki Suomen Yleisradio Network in Finnish 1600 GMT 13 Feb 92

[Text] Two agreements regulating trade between Finland and Estonia have been concluded during Prime Minister Esko Aho's working visit to Estonia. Finland is the first country with which Estonia has signed such agreements. Ulla-Maija Maeaettaenen reports:

[Maeaettaenen] Prime Minister Esko Aho first met his opposite number, Tiit Vahi, here in Tallinn, and after a brief discussion the prime ministers signed two agreements: a temporary free trade agreement and an agreement on the protection of investments. These agreements guarantee the duty-free entry of goods, the operation of joint ventures, the recovery of profits, and so on. Trade between Finland and Estonia has now been made official after a break of several decades. In the past Finland conducted a clearing trade with the Estonians, within the framework of the agreements with the Soviet Union, as well as border trade. During Estonia's independence trade was lively, but slight after that. Perestroyka brought joint ventures here; there currently are over 100 of them, but half of them function only on paper. Sweden has overtaken Finland in the amount of investments.

Estonia is, however, a nearby marketing area for Finland, and therefore important. Prime Minister Esko Aho noted in his speech at the signing ceremony that today a foundation has been laid for economic relations between Estonia and Finland. Aho believes that with the agreements the interest of Finnish businessmen in Estonia would grow. The Estonian side hopes so, too. Prime Minister Aho was certain that the agreements would again raise Finland into a leading position in Estonia's trade. Finland is interested in the textiles sector and in the forest industry, Estonia in cooperation in the wood-processing industry.

In 1990 Finland's trade exchange with Estonia was about 500 million Finnish marks [FM], with Latvia about FM100 million, and with Lithuania a few tens of millions of FM. Thus Estonia is our biggest trading partner in the Baltic. According to the statistics of the National Board of Customs, the compiling of which was started in November-December last year, the trade amounted to FM 77 million. The balance of trade showed a surplus for Finland. Finland's biggest imports from Estonia consisted of scrap metal and ore.

During his brief visit Prime Minister Esko Aho also met President Arnold Ruutel and visited an export exhibition of Finnish products, which is now being held in Tallinn for the fifth time.

Officials Meet With Council of Europe Secretary

OW1902222992 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1941 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Secretary-General of the Council of Europe, Catherine Lalumiere, has met in Tallinn with head of the Estonian parliament Arnold Ruutel, Premier Tiit Vahi, Foreign Minister Lennart Meri, as well as representatives of parliamentary factions and ethnic minorities.

At a press conference shortly after the meetings Lalumiere stated that the main aim of her visit to Estonia was to look into the human rights situation there. (Last September Estonia applied for membership of the Council of Europe. As is known, the necessary conditions for Council of Europe membership are the availability of a constitution amid human rights observance.)

Lalumiere said that Estonia's Russian community is deeply concerned about the introduction of the 1938 Law on Citizenship which may leave a lot of Russians without a citizenship. In this connection, she expressed the hope that "a compromise will be reached over the problem of citizenship".

Before coming to Estonia Lalumiere had visited Vilnius and Riga where she studied the status of ethnic minorities in Lithuania and Latvia. This evening she left for Strasbourg.

CIS Trade Procedures Established 17 Feb

LD1902085492 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] Tallinn February 18 (ETA-TASS)—The Estonian Customs Department established as of February 17 the same procedure in trade with members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and other countries of the rouble zone as in trade with countries where convertible currency is used.

This is connected with the unification of export and import operations by the Estonian Republic. Export and import operations will be conducted on a basis of internationally recognised documents, customs declarations. At the initial stage, goods on which quotas were imposed will be declared at Estonia's eastern and southern borders. Later this practice will become uniform.

Lithuania

Troops To Leave Even Without Bilateral Accord

To Begin Exiting in Feb

OW1502185492 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1732 GMT 15 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian and Lithuanian experts on withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania completed their meeting in Vilnius Friday [14 February]. They agreed to start the withdrawal no matter whether an official bilateral agreement is signed or not. Russian experts confirmed that troops will begin leaving Lithuania in February.

Heads of the experts groups A. Abisala (Lithuania) and V. Isakov (Russia) will present the official delegations of the two countries with the protocol of their meeting. The delegations are to decide whether to start official bilateral talks or to hold another meeting of experts. As Abisala put it, both options "are possible and acceptable".

In an interview with BF [BALTFAX] shortly after the meeting, Minister Without Portfolio and leader of the Lithuanian expert group Abisala said that Lithuania's position will remain unchanged: it insists that troops should abandon Lithuania within 4-5 months. In the words of Abisala, Russia "has not yet revealed its position".

Lithuanian Home Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius noted that the meeting of experts showed that there are no technical obstacles to the withdrawal. However, he refused to indicate the exact terms of the withdrawal.

Lithuanian MP [member of parliament] Romualdas Ozolas told BF that experts had been working in three groups. The first one discussed general principles and protocol, the other examined technical aspects of the withdrawal and the third focused on indemnification for losses inflicted to Lithuania by Soviet troops between 1940 and 1992, as well as social guarantees for the military.

Defense Minister Satisfied

LD1802144292 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Text] Defense Minister Audrius Butkevicius has expressed his satisfaction over the consultation meeting between Lithuanian and Russian experts concerning questions of the withdrawal of the former Soviet Army from Lithuania. The meeting ended today.

The round of consultations by experts that had commenced on 11 February was described by the minister as difficult, however, Butkevicius said, it constitutes a serious beginning.

One thing is clear, namely that the former Soviet Army now under the jurisdiction of Russia is to be withdrawn from Lithuania; serious preparations are being made for this task noted Audrius Butkevicius. Vilnius and Moscow experts discussed in Vilnius the order of individual stages in the Army's withdrawal and also the factors exerting an influence on the speed of the withdrawal.

The minister refused to comment on the possible dates for the Army's withdrawal pointing to the fact that these questions have not yet been coordinated. According to the Government Press Bureau agreement has been reached that the Army's withdrawal will commence and will be carried out independently of the time when the official interstate agreements will be signed.

The Russian representatives have affirmed that the Army's withdrawal will be initiated this month. It is not being announced for the time being as to how the Lithuanian and Russian representatives will continue the work. It is possible that an official negotiation round between state delegations may soon be organized even though the possibility is not being rejected that an expert group will meet once more prior to that.

Landsbergis on Army Withdrawal

LD1602151992 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 14 Feb 92

["Traditional" interview with Vytautas Landsbergis by journalist Balys Urbonas; date and place not given—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Urbonas] Was a very important issue to both Lithuania and Germany—the withdrawal of the Soviet Army—discussed? Maybe the Germans will encourage European countries and Germany itself will render assistance in building those apartments for the officers?

[Landsbergis] There was talk about it. Maybe one should not think about this on its own. We are included in such

a chain of demands; for instance, when apartments are available for the officers, only then will the Army be able to move. This is the problem of Russia itself, or the problem of the Commonwealth of Independent States. We have said repeatedly that we could help to solve it, but this solution cannot be imposed on us.

Germany has experienced the fact that, although it has signed a treaty and is building the apartments or houses, they are not always allocated to those officers who are withdrawn from Germany. This provokes concern, and the Germans are observing this with greater interest. Germany, of course, will continue to fulfil its promise but it understands our situation well, to the effect that this alone does not comprise the problems of the withdrawal of the Army. It is very well understood that the stay of the Army is a much greater problem to stability in the Baltic and to stability in Europe.

We also discussed the withdrawal of the Army from Germany and from Lithuania, and also the withdrawal of the Army from Germany via Lithuania. One such practical aspect is the state of our railways. The former Soviet Union, the present Russia, pays nothing for carrying dangerous military loads and the Army from Germany on our worn-out railways, where accidents are possible. This issue must be solved with Russia but we may expect and, I think, we will receive technical help from Germany in the reconstruction of our railways so that they operate well, and that the withdrawal of the Army from Germany is not disturbed. Payment for the use of the railways is another question, but Germany is ready to help in railway technology and improvement of the rails. Mr. Kohl himself asked me to write several letters, memoranda, on various issues explaining the problem. They will consider [words indistinct].

Landsbergis Interviewed

LD2002044492 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Italicized passages recorded in Lithuanian with superimposed translation into English]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The head of the Lithuanian parliament, 50 year old Professor of Fine Arts Vytautas Landsbergis, sees the future of his country in mutually advantageous cooperation and political accord with all countries of the world. Mr. Landsbergis has just returned from Germany, therefore the first question of our correspondent Aleksandr Peltu was about the results of the visit. [passage omitted]

And what is Mr. Landsbergis's opinion of the future of the Kaliningrad region?

[Landsbergis] *The Kaliningrad region must be demilitarized. In the new situation, a (?sense) of Army units may be viewed as a survival of the former policy and ideology of the Soviet empire, which was always prepared to expand its influence and possessions. The European states have rejected such policy and expressed a desire to cooperate on an equal footing. This iron fist in the center of Europe may give rise to misunderstanding.*

[Announcer] The troops of the former Soviet Union will shortly start to withdraw from Lithuania, but this is a complicated and a [word indistinct] process. Besides, it effects tne future of the military. (?Will) accords have been reached with the Russian President Boris Yeltsin to this end?

[Landsbergis] *We have agreed that Russia will begin to withdraw troops in February, but the deadline for the troops withdrawal has not been set up yet since this is a complicated issue. We have just exchanged opinions. The Russian leaders believe this process will take several years. The military (?then) wish to link the troops witdrawal from Lithuania with that from Germany. We do not think these two processes should be linked. Troops are deployed in smaller quantities in Lithuania and their status is different. Troops from Lithuania can and must be withdrawn earlier, maybe in several months or half a year. I am convinced the process must be completed this year.*

[Announcer] You have invited the Russian President Boris Yeltsin to visit Lithuania. Have you specified the terms of the visit?

[Landsbergis] *President Yeltsin has expressed consent and a wish to visit Lithuania shortly but no concrete date has been agreed upon. We suggested for one the 11th of March, the day of Lithuania's independence. We will be glad to see him on the occasion in the country but the president's schedule is very tight no doubt.*

Landsbergis Delivers Independence Day Address

LD1802204392 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1310 GMT 16 Feb 92

[Speech by Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis at 16 February meeting marking Lithuanian's independence day; place not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] Esteemed assembled, dear guests and citizens of Lithuania, ladies and gentlemen: Please allow me to greet you on the occasion of the observance of Lithuania's Independence Day and to share with you certain thoughts.

For Lithuania, 16 February is a date which we mark on our calendars and recall annually as the most important state holiday. For the rest of the time it constitutes not a date but something much more than a date. It is 16 February of those years—16 February during the months of March and January—an idea constantly in existence and a right, for which one struggles, for which one dies, because it has become the principal spiritual value, not to be replaced by anything else.

Of course, one struggles and dies, since 16 February has become such a value. [passage omitted]

The start of the Voice of America Lithuanian broadcasts on 16 February, 1951, while partisan resistance was still taking place, and the proclamations of U.S. Presidents regarding 16 February already following the birth of the current Sajudis Movement, the 16 February, 1989, declaration by Sajudis itself, the oath taken by the Sajudis Seimas on that day, beside the Freedom Monument—all these bigger and smaller steps expressed and affirmed one principle of right and led toward the goal of independence. [passage omitted]

There is a common link between February 1918 and March 1990 and I shall attempt to define it. It is an aspiration that has matured within the nation based on an inherent and an international law, which must be expressed by an open political act—a decision by authorized representatives. This is brought about not by guessing nor by paying heed to intimidation regarding tomorrow's after- effects. Pragmatic, so-called realistic or conformist considerations withdraw to the sidelines. National representatives must carry out the duty perceived by them.

Then, a new spiritual quality appears in the life of the nation and of society, a verification of values begins.

This is what they are trying to deprive us of—the love of our homeland and the concept of honor, in order to destroy the very basis of humanity. These values have to be regained and to be found within the depths of our hearts. Not all have discovered these yet. After all, for such a long since it was permitted to call it a homeland, the native land, the republic, but not Lithuania, our homeland. [passage omitted] They were forcing us to choose between honor and life and we know what the children of the 16 February idea used to choose. Young men and women used to leave for the partisan groups. Others chose a life as understood by them. Those who chose life were also necessary so that from the humiliation of coercion, from the bowing down and retreating an unconditional feeling of honor would again be reborn, some day, not to retreat anymore. [passage omitted]

Independence remains very vulnerable and we have not done and are not doing everything to render it less vulnerable. Foreign soldiers have been roaming along our borders. In spite of numerous justifiable demands, even our capital has not yet been made completely free of them, not to mention the whole country.

The protection of Lithuania will not be assured simply by securing the withdrawal of these troops. The threat to independence will remain. It is necessary for the old Soviet Armed Forces to withdraw also from Kaliningrad Oblast. Its concentration there has become a historical anachronism, a threat to all the Baltic neighbors and this threat will always be the greatest to us.

Economic independence, and first of all independence in power engineering, in other words the security of Lithuanian power engineernig, remains more a goal to be achieved than a job half done. [passage omitted]

In case any undesirable political changes take place in the east in the form of reaction and the revival of imperialism, we would be vulnerable not only because of the foreign troops illegally lingering on, but also in the sphere of power engineering. [passage omitted] It is not a secret that in the event of a power engineering crisis, or in case of a crisis in other major resources, coupled with a rapid increase in unemployment and social unrest, the intention would immediately be voiced to drag Lithuania back into the sphere of political—and not only political—dependence of the eastern bloc. [passage omitted]

Yeltsin Sends Congratulations

LD1602012292 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2230 GMT 15 Feb 92

[Text] The Russian president, Boris Yeltsin, has sent a congratulations telegram to the Lithuanian parliament chairman, Vytautas Landsbergis, on the occasion of 16 February, the day of the reestablishment of the Lithuanian state.

The telegram says: I hope that the friendly relations between Russia and Lithuania, based on principles of equal rights and mutual respect, will be expanded in every way for the benefit of the nations of our states.

Landsbergis Says CIS 'Stabilizing Factor'

LD1702195492 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Text] According to ITAR-TASS Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, said on Belarussian Television that the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] is a stabilizing factor among the former subjects of the USSR.

Commenting on the idea of a commonwealth of Black Sea and Baltic Sea states, he said that this idea was advanced a year or so ago, at a time when there was concern that Russia could lag behind the democratic processes. At present democratic reforms are being carried out by Russia itself. The idea of the commonwealth of Black Sea and Baltic Sea states can now be transformed into specific relations of a regional nature, including Lithuanian-Belarussian relations, and not into a political union.

Speaking about Lithuania's participation in the CIS, Landsbergis indicated that the Republic of Lithuania wants to be a good neighbor of the CIS.

Landsbergis Meets Council of Europe Secretary

OW1702214892 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1920 GMT 17 Feb 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the Lithuanian parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis, had a meeting with the Secretary-General

of the Council of Europe, Catherine Lalumiere, who was visiting Vilnius. Mr. Landsbergis and Ms. Lalumiere discussed the political situation and some aspects of the work on a new Lithuanian constitution. At a press conference after the meeting, Ms. Lalumiere said the main obstacles to Lithuania's admission to the Council of Europe were the absence of a constitution and national minority problems. In her opinion, the Polish issue still existed in Lithuania and had to be resolved by compromise between the Lithuanian government and the Polish community. She expressed the hope that Lithuania could join the Council of Europe by the end of this year but remarked that this could only happen if the two above-mentioned problems were solved.

Today (February 17) Ms. Lalumiere has arrived in Riga. Tomorrow morning she will meet the head of the Latvian parliament, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis and members of all groups in the parliament. After this she will address the parliament.

Tomorrow afternoon Ms. Lalumiere is leaving for Estonia.

Quayle Visit, Relations with U.S. Assessed

PM1802123192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Feb 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Nikolay Lashkevich: "What Did U.S. Vice President D. Quayle's Visit to Lithuania Achieve?"]

[Text] It is the first time a U.S. statesman of such seniority has visited Lithuania.

The meetings with V. Landsbergis and G. Vagnorius focused attention on questions of economic and political links with Russia. At a news conference, answering a question about the assessment of the situation in Lithuania and Russia, D. Quayle stressed in particular that the United States wants to see strong economies both in Lithuania and in Russia. "We hope," he said, "that both these countries will take a step forward toward democratization of society and economic development and that human rights will be guaranteed there." There is every reason to say that the 10,000 strong rally in Independence Square, near the Lithuanian parliament building, which was addressed by D. Quayle and V. Landsbergis, was the high point of the visit. The people in the square went into raptures when the vice president opened his speech in Lithuanian: "Greetings, Free Lithuania." In his speech D. Quayle expressed his admiration for the Lithuanian people's struggle for independence and paid tribute to V. Landsbergis, "who fought heroically for freedom for all of you and inspired his people for the future."

Before leaving for the airport, D. Quayle attended the opening of the new building of the U.S. Embassy in Lithuania. Henceforth the embassy will occupy the impressive building of the former Lithuanian Foreign Ministry. At the airport, in the late afternoon, he handed over to representatives of the Lithuanian Republic a cargo of humanitarian aid which had arrived by then from the United States on four aircraft. It comprised five tonnes of medicines and 20 tonnes of food. By mid-February 100,000 tonnes of grain will have arrived in Lithuania by ship.

Did the visit, which lasted nearly a whole day, produce any specific results? The answer to this question can be found in three documents signed at the Supreme Council. The treaty on the program for the activities of the U.S. Peace Corps provides for assistance in the study of English, development of small businesses, and environmental protection.

More specific assistance is reflected in two other agreements: on subsidies for the republic's economy and economic assistance in the reconstruction of the Lithuanian State Regional Electric Power Station in Elektrenai. But by and large—and journalists have noted this—the U.S. contribution to the Lithuanian economy's revival remains slight.

Judging by G. Vagnorius' emphasis at the news conference on his government's guarantees to back foreign capital through legal protection and provide every incentive for investment, one may conclude that U.S. businessmen are rather cautious about the prospect of injections of finance into the Lithuanian econonmy. At any rate, D. Quayle, in his speeches, did not give any firm promises of specific, large scale assistance, confining himself to high-sounding words about freedom, human rights, democratization, and the free market. If you recall that the United States was equally cautious about giving effective economic assistance to Russia, then you will understand its approach to the problem of the Lithuanian economy. The Americans are obviously in no hurry to drag the former republics of the USSR out of the economic morass. But it is not impossible that this is just the start of a long process of talks on economic links between the two countries.

For its part, the Lithuanian government again confirmed its willingness to guarantee all foreign credits received by enterprises and institutions in the republic.

'Crimes' By Military Units Cause for Concern

Telegram Sent to Shakhray

LD1602062792 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0200 GMT 14 Feb 92

[Text] Vice Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila has sent a telegram to the Russian vice prime minister, Sergey Shakhray, expressing his concern about the situation in military units subordinated to Russia. The telegram mentions an anti-aircraft defense unit deployed in Vilnius Rayon where, according to the telegram, many crimes have been committed by the soldiers. The unit leadership has been informed about each such case, but it has failed to take any action.

In the telegram Vaisvila asks the Russian vice prime minister to speed up the withdrawal of military units, and to take measures so that the soldiers strictly abide by Lithuanian laws.

Commander Arrested After Search

LD1902225992 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 19 Feb 92

[Text] Today Lithuanian state security and police officials arrested Major (Kiyenko), commander of the military garrison of the forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] deployed in Panevezys. He was arrested after weapons, ammunition, and grenades were found during a search of his apartment. The search was carried out during an investigation of explosions, arson, and illegal trading in weapons which have taken place in Panevezys.

The government information bureau reports that General Kolesnikov, commander of the Air Force division of the former Soviet Union's Army deployed near Panevezys, threatened the Panevezys police commissariat that he would use force if the arrested officers were not released by 1700.

According to the government press bureau, Deputy Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila immediately informed the leadership of the staff of the CIS Armed Forces and Russian deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray about the incident. The Russian deputy prime minister and Deputy Chief of Staff Grachev gave an assurance that force would not be used. Russia's authorized representatives will be sent to Lithuania immediately.

Russia Resumes Oil Supplies After Disruption

LD1802104492 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0200 GMT 18 Feb 92

[Text] At around 1600 this afternoon [17 February], Russia resumed oil supplies to Lithuania. This was confirmed to Vilnius Radio by the duty officer at the Mazeikiai Oil Refinery, who added that oil supplies from Russia were cut off completely from 13 February until today, that is, for four days, and the refinery was compelled to operate on the lowest capacity in order not to disrupt the technological process. So far, we have been unable to discover why the oil supply was cut. The BALTIC NEWS SERVICE agency quoted a statement made by the Lithuanian Embassy in Moscow before supplies were resumed, which said that the disruption contravenes the agreement between the leaders of the Lithuanian and Russian Governments to deliver oil to Lithuania on favorable terms for the first quarter of this year.

Former KGB Officers Send Warning in Letter

LD1302164492 Moscow TASS in English 0902 GMT 13 Feb 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] "If Lithuanian parliament adopts a law on desovietisation, if we, former KGB officers who now have other jobs giving us bread, are sacked from government offices, we shall have to retaliate", a group of 38 former KGB officers wrote in an open letter to the independent daily RESPUBLICA.

Two years ago Lithuanian parliament published decrees according to which persons having broken with the former KGB would not be abused in any way. Nevertheless, parliament is currently discussing a draft law on restrictions which envisages bans for former communist functionaries and former KGB collaborators for jobs in such spheres as police, customs, border guard, law enforcement, education and other.

The former KGB officers hinted they could disclose many secrets if the government did not keep its promises.